THE PROCEEDINGS
of
The South Carolina Historical Association
1998

THE PROCEEDINGS
of
The South Carolina Historical Association
1998

S.C. 975.7 SOUTH 1998 Cp.2

South Carolina Historical Association.

The proceedings of the South Carolina Historical

The South
The U

The Proceedings o

Editor's Notes

At its annual meeting in March 1994, the South Carolina Historical Association decided to change its approach to the content of The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association. In the past, all paper presented at the annual meeting were published automatically. Starting with the 1995 issue, only those papers deemed suitable by the editorial board are published. Some papers may be presented in abstract form.

The 1998 issue of The Proceedings would not have been possible without the efforts of Erin McKinney and Joann Bone of the Computer Services Department of the University of South Carolina at Aiken.

Minor spacing and font irregularities are due to the variety of word processing programs used by our contributing authors.

The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association is a refereed journal that contains selected papers and abstracts of papers presented at the annual meeting. The editor and the Executive Board will serve as the editorial board in conjunction with members selected for their expertise. The editor disclaims any responsiblity for the scholarship, statement of fact and opinion, and the conclusions of the contributors.

Contents

Barbarians as a Destabilizing Factor in The Late Roman Empire: The Case of Magnus Maximus

In the fourth century A.D., the Roman Empire was beset by internal dissension among its leaders and external threats from barbarians. On occasion, these two problems became interconnected. Such was the case with the usurpation of Magnus Maximus (A.D. 383-88), a Roman general stationed in Britain. In the spring of A.D. 383, Maximus' legions proclaimed him emperor, and he crossed into the Gaul (the area approximating modern France) and eliminated Gratian (A.D. 367-83), the senior reigning emperor in the west. Maximus set up his court at the city of Trier, where he obtained recognition from the two legitimate emperors Valentinian II (A.D. 375-92) in Italy and Theodosius I (A.D. 379-95) in Constantinople (modern Istanbul). Maximus ruled Gaul, Spain, Britain, and Africa for five years before being defeated by Theodosius.[1] This essay examines the role that barbarians played in the elevation and reign of Magnus Maximus, with a view towards showing how barbarians contributed to the internal political instability of the Roman empire. Through exposure to dealing with barbarians in Britain, Raetia (modern Switzerland), Africa, and on the Danubian frontier as a Roman military officer, Maximus learned how to successfully utilize barbarians in his rise to power.

Before proceeding further, several conventions have been adopted for this essay. First, all dates are A.D. unless otherwise specified. Secondly, the term barbarian is used as a non-pejorative term, because this is the term that the Romans themselves used to describe any of the peoples living beyond the frontiers who did not recognize the political supremacy of Rome.[2] Finally modern place names have been used where possible or included in parentheses after the Roman name.

By the late fourth century A.D., barbarians continued to be perceived as the general enemy of the Roman state, although many were rapidly becoming incorporated into Roman society at all levels--social, economic, and political. Any Roman general who hoped to advance his political and military career had to take this fact into account. Thus, generals by this time still earned their reputation by fighting barbarians who would not submit to peaceful relations with Rome, but increasingly various barbarian groups were being taken into the Roman army or contracting alliances whereby they were given land in return for military service to the empire. Because the emperors of this period came to rely on their military prowess as an indicator of their success, dealing with barbarians became an integral part of this office. All of these trends were present in Magnus Maximus' rise to power.

Maximus' earliest attested location was in Britain from A.D. 367-9, where the fifth century historian Zosimus tells us that he campaigned with the general Theodosius, father of the emperor of the same name. Theodosius had been sent to Britain by the emperor Valentinian I (A.D. 364-375) to put down an uprising of Picts, Attacotti, and Scots, barbarian raiders living in the areas of modern Scotland and Ireland. Zosimus and the other ancient sources are unclear as to the specific role Maximus played in this conflict, but he saw the political implications resulting from successfully handling a barbarian threat, for Valentinian I promoted Theodosius from *comes rei militaris*, or commander of a field army, to *magister equitum*, commander of the army in the western part of the empire. This is an indication that military success against external enemies was one of the keys to military, and hence political, promotion in the late empire.

The issue, however, of barbarians and their relations with the empire during this period was a complex one. Not all barbarians were enemies of the empire. Rome had many allies who were of barbarian origin, but such partnerships were often unreliable, as barbarian leaders would sometimes challenge Roman authority. This was the case with the Alamannic king Macrianus. the Alamanni were a group of barbarians who inhabited the lands around the Rhine river. In A.D. 370 Valentinian I declared war upon

Macrianus because the latter broke his allegiance to Rome by making border raids into Raetia. Valentinian called upon Theodosius in A.D..372 to help deal with this recalcitrant ally, but Theodosius was unable to effect the capture of the rogue king. One of the results of Theodosius' unsuccessful campaign, however, was the submission of another Alamannic leader, Fraomar, to Roman rule. Valentinian sent Fraomar with his Alamannic followers to Britain to buttress the Roman forces there, which were still recovering from the recent trouble. This event was important for two reasons. First it shows the incorporation of barbarians into the Roman military. Secondly, if Maximus were in Raetia at this time, he may have had contacts with Fraomar. This is important because later in his career, he appears to have had some Alamannic support in his bid for imperial power, and Fraomar may be the one to have supplied it, although none of the ancient sources directly state this.

Shortly after his mission in Raetia, Valentinian sent Theodosius to Africa to deal with yet another rebel barbarian leader, the Moorish chieftain Firmus. The Moors were a group of barbarians inhabiting northern Africa. Firmus was a Roman client who revolted in A.D. 373 after getting into a political quarrel with Romanus, the Roman general in charge of Africa's defenses. Gildo's revolt occurred against a larger backdrop of the exploitation of the African provincials by Romanus. It is certain that Maximus was with Theodosius in Africa, for he is mentioned by the fourth century historian Ammianus Marcellinus. Upon his arrival in Africa, Theodosius assigned Maximus to work with Gildo, a brother of Firmus. Like Firmus, Gildo was in the service of Rome when the general unrest in Africa broke out, but unlike his brother, Gildo had remained loyal to the Roman government. Maximus and Gildo were sent to arrest Vincentius, a Roman civil official who was suspected to be an accomplice of Romanus. For reasons that are not stated, Maximus and Gildo failed to capture Vincentius, but they did capture two high-ranking Moorish supporters of Firmus, who were subsequently put to death. In the meantime, after a lengthy campaign, Theodosius captured Firmus and restored order to Africa. Through his service in Africa, Maximus gained an association with the Moors in general, and Gildo in particular. When Maximus later became emperor, the alliance he formed with Gildo would play a crucial role in his accession.

In 375, Valentinian died while on campaign against the Quadi, another barbarian group. The western part of the empire was divided between his two sons Gratian and Valentinian II. Gratian was only sixteen, while Valentinian II was but four years of age. Consequently, the generals in the west had a strong hand in running affairs, and Theodosius was executed in A.D..375 or 376 as a result of the maneuvering for political position among Valentinian I's top generals. Maximus, however, continued his rise through the ranks of the army unaffected, his next assignment being on the Danubian frontier. Maximus and Lupicinus were the two Roman officers charged with establishing the Goths, a barbarian people from the Black Sea region, on Roman soil. The Goths petitioned Valens (A.D. 364-378), the brother of Valentinian I and the emperor in charge of the eastern portion of the empire, for land in Thrace in order to escape from the Huns, another group of barbarians of Asiatic origin. The Goths promised to furnish the Romans with auxiliaries in return for settlement inside the empire. Valens agreed to this, but Lupicinus and Maximus began to exploit the refugees, deliberately withholding food supplies and making the Goths supply slaves in return for food. In addition, the two generals were very careless in managing the settlement of the Goths, allowing them to remain in cohesive groups and failing to detect the weapons that the Goths smuggled in. The Goths finally revolted due to their poor treatment at the hands of Maximus and Lupicinus, and because they had been allowed to maintain their political and military unity, a local rebellion soon became an uprising that threatened the security of the entire diocese of Thrace (modern Bulgaria).

Valens mobilized his eastern legions to deal with the crisis, and requested help from Gratian, but Gratian was delayed by an uprising of the Alamanni on the Gallic border, and Valens decided to attack the Goths alone. He led the eastern army into an ambush at the battle of Adrianople (modern Edirne) on August 9, A.D. 378. Valens, most of his officer corps, and the majority of the eastern army were destroyed. With the Goths ravaging Thrace and the Balkan peninsula unmolested, Gratian recalled the

son of Theodosius the Elder from exile in Spain and put him in charge of the eastern army. Theodosius' initial successes led to his acclamation as eastern emperor in A.D.. 379, and he eventually settled the crisis in Thrace by entering into a series of treaties with the Goths whereby they would cease attacking Roman forces and supply recruits to the Roman army if they were given land for settlement.

After Adrianople, Maximus was given command of a field army in Britain. The military situation in Britain was still tenuous, and the Picts and Scots staged another invasion in A.D. 381. It was after successfully defeating this incursion that Maximus made a bid to become emperor in the west. He used his victory over the Picts and Scots to encourage his troops to mutiny. This attested by the numismatic evidence, where Maximus issued a donative to his soldiers with the legend RESITUTOR REIPUBLICAE ("restorer of the state"). This legend was common imperial propaganda, portraying the issuing emperor as the "restorer of the state." This type of issue often came after a major victory over barbarians, and was an attempt to show the soldiers that the emperor in question was capable of both defeating the enemy and rewarding his army handsomely. Maximus' troops decided to back his bid for power, and proclaimed him emperor in the spring of A.D. 383.

In addition to using his victory over the Picts and Scots as a platform for advancing his image, Maximus used this victory to sully the image of Gratian, portraying Gratian as "soft" in dealing with barbarians. The ancient sources reported that Maximus played on the soldiers supposed jealousy of the Alan bodyguard of Gratian. The Alans were yet another group of barbarians, probably from the steppes of southern Russia. According to Zosimus:

> He [Gratian] took in some Alan deserters, enrolled them in the army and rewarded them with lavish gifts; . . . This bred a hatred of the Emperor in his soldiers, which slowly smoldering and growing, incited them, especially those in the British islands. . . . They were encouraged in this by Maximus.

Thus, Maximus was portraying himself as the champion of the Roman soldiery, out on the frontiers protecting the citizens against barbarians, while Gratian sat at Trier, surrounded by Alan courtiers and ignoring his other troops.

After being declared emperor by his soldiers, Maximus crossed into Gaul to confront Gratian. Gratian was already in northern Gaul fighting off a fresh invasion of the Alamanni. Although none of the ancient sources are explicit on this account, these Alamanni may have been the Alamanni of Fraomar, sent by Maximus to draw Gratian out and wear down his forces before Maximus decided to cross with the main body of his troops. Regardless, Maximus and Gratian finally met in a series of minor skirmishes near Paris, where after five days Gratian's Moorish cavalry went over to Maximus. Most of Gratian's remaining troops soon followed suit, including his leading general Merobaudes, and Gratian was forced to flee with only 300 cavalry, who were probably his Alan supporters. At Lyons, he was lured into an ambush by Andragathius, Maximus' *magister equitum*, and killed on 25 August A.D. 383. It is interesting to note two things about Maximus' brief struggle with Gratian. First, the Moorish cavalry, a very small segment of Gratian's army, were the group to swing the tide of battle over to Maximus. Once again no source directly deals with the issue, but Maximus' may have had influence over the Moors as a result of his prior friendship with Gildo. There is precedent for this possibility, as Gildo was given control of Africa by Maximus later on. Furthermore, Andragathius and Merobaudes were barbarians. Andragathius was a native of the Black Sea region, making him a Goth in all probability, while Merobaudes' name suggests a Frankish origin. Once again barbarians are found in the Roman military, and Maximus ability to secure the loyalty of barbarian troops was a key to his success, while Gratian's betrayal by some of the same troops led to his downfall.

After defeating Gratian, Maximus settled at Trier to consolidate his power. He sent embassies both to Valentinian II in Aquileia (now destroyed, but near modern Udine) and Theodosius I in Constantinople in an attempt to obtain recognition of his position. Barbarian's figured greatly in Maximus' attempt to

legitimize his rule. He continued to portray himself as the repairer of the state by attempting to discredit the advisers of Valentinian II, who was still a minor. By insinuating that the advisors of the young emperor, including the Frankish general Bauto, were attempting to use Valentinian II as a means to their own power, Maximus hoped to invalidate Valentinian's right to be emperor while bolstering his own claims.

This tactic is seen in a letter of Ambrose, Bishop of Milan. Ambrose wrote a letter recounting his reception at Maximus court in the winter of A.D. 383, where he had been sent as an ambassador by the court of Valentinian II. According to Ambrose, Maximus wanted Valentinian II to submit to his power. When Ambrose refused this request, the meeting degenerated into a series of accusations, and one of the topics was barbarians. Maximus was angry that Bauto had come into Raetia with his army, which included Hun and Alan allies. Maximus declared to Ambrose:

> You and that Bauto have deceived me. He wanted to get the power himself under the figurehead of a child and he sent barbarians against me; as if I do not have just as many thousands of barbarians in my service and pay whom I can call upon.

Maximus was trying to show that it was Bauto who was unduly influencing Valentinian II, by sending troops against Maximus unprovoked. According to Maximus' rhetoric, Bauto was a barbarian, whose devotion to the empire could be questioned. Maximus, on the other hand, was a Roman general who had proven his loyalty to the state by successfully subjugating barbarians and using them in defense of the empire. Maximus' statement also indicates that both Valentinian II and Maximus were using barbarian soldiers in their armies. Maximus' use of such troops is also supported by the fifth century historian Orosius, who stated, ". . . fierce Maximus exacts taxes and military service from the most savage German peoples solely by the terror of his name . . .." Orosius and Ambrose may be referring to the Alamanni, who, as was suggested earlier, were Maximus' clients.

Ambrose refuted Maximus' allegations by showing that Maximus was not the champion he claimed to be. According to Ambrose, Bauto had come into Raetia because an invasion of the Juthungi, yet another group of barbarians, was threatening the Alpine passes into Italy. It seems that rather than defend Raetia against an invasion of the Juthungi, Maximus withheld his Alamannic allies for a possible invasion of Italy. This forced Bauto to Huns and Alans allied to Valentinian II against the Juthungi. The Alans in question may have been the same ones courted by Gratian, although none of the sources mention this fact. After defeating the Juthungi, Bauto had to withdraw so that he would not provoke Maximus to attack.

Ambrose's embassy did buy time for Bauto to fortify the Alpine passes. Maximus could not invade Italy at this time because of this, but by the same token, his forces were too strong to be defeated by either Bauto or Theodosius' depleted eastern army. Thus, Valentinian II and Theodosius I accepted Maximus as a co-emperor in A.D.. 384. Maximus was ruled Gaul, Spain, Britain, and Africa, while Valentinian II retained rule in Italy, with Theodosius I ruling in the east. Maximus broke the peace in A.D. 387, however, when he invaded Italy, trying to displace Valentinian once and for all. Almost immediately, Maximus' policy of dealing with barbarians began to unravel. When Maximus crossed into Italy, a group of Franks crossed the Rhine and began ravaging Gaul, and a legion was destroyed before Maximus' generals that had been left behind could restore peace.

Meanwhile, Theodosius I had gathered an army containing a great many barbarians in it and marched into Italy. Maximus managed to bribe some of these barbarian troops, who fled into the swamps when they were discovered by Theodosius. They were subsequently hunted down and destroyed, and Theodosius continued his march toward Italy. After losing two battles at Siscia (Sisak) and Emona (Ljubljana), Maximus finally capitulated at Aquileia, where he was executed on 12 August A.D. 388. Pacatus, a Gallic orator who wrote a panegyric to Theodosius upon his victory over Maximus, related that ". . . a few of the Moorish enemy, whom he had shut up with him like a hellish brigade . . . were slain as expiatory victims of the war." Thus the reign of Maximus had come to an end, and appropriately enough it was a group of barbarians that were his last supporters.

Barbarians were a key element in Magnus Maximus' rise to power. Maximus followed the example of Theodosius the Elder and built a solid military career by knowing which barbarians to fight and which ones to ally with. By cultivating his relationship with leaders of Moorish and Alamannic troops loyal to the empire, and playing on the jealousy of Gratian's troops toward Gratian's Alan bodyguard, Maximus was able to seize power. Once on the throne he attempted to legitimize his power by portraying himself as the restorer of the state, accusing the advisors of Valentinian II of being collaborators with barbarians. After gaining acceptance, he fell prey to the same tactics he had used to gain power. When Maximus invaded Italy, he could not recruit as many barbarian allies as Theodosius, and he lost soldiers to external barbarian invasions in Gaul. Finally, further studies on the use of barbarians by usurpers in the late Roman empire need to be done to determine if Magnus Maximus' policies regarding barbarians were an anomaly.

ENDNOTES

1. .For more on the reign of Magnus Maximus in general see John F. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court A.D. 364-425* (Oxford, 1975), 173-92; and Walter E. Roberts, "Magnus Maximus: Portrait of a Usurper" (M.A. Thesis, University of South Carolina, 1997).

2. See Hugh Elton, "Defining Romans, Barbarians, and the Roman Frontier," in *Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity*, eds. Ralph W. Mathisen and Hagith S. Sivan (Aldershut, 1996), 126-35; For further criteria for defining barbarians see Ralph W. Mathisen, *Roman Aristocrats in Barbarian Gaul: Strategies for Survival in an Age of Transition* (Austin, 1993), 39-49.

3. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284-602* (Norman, 1964); J.B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire* (New York, 1958); Thomas S. Burns, *Barbarians Within the Gates of Rome: A Study of Roman Military Policy and the Barbarians, ca. 375-425 A.D.* (Bloomington, 1994); Mathisen, *Roman Aristocrats*.

4. Zosimus, *Historia Nova*, 4.35.3 in *Zosime: Histoire Nouvelle Tome 2 2e partie*, ed. and trans. F. Paschoud (Paris, 1986).

5. For the details of the campaign see the fourth century historian Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, 27.8 and 28.3 in *Ammianus Marcellinus* (3 vols.) ed. and trans. J. C. Rolfe (London, 1964). For modern scholarship see R. Tomlin, "The Date of the 'Barbarian Conspiracy'," *Brittania* 5 (1974): 303-309; and R.C. Blockley,"The Date of the 'Barbarian Conspiracy'," *Brittania* 11 (1980): 223-225.

6. Burns, *Barbarians Within the Gates*, xiii-xxi.

7. Ammianus, 29.4.2-7.

8. In all likelihood Theodosius was accompanied to Raetia by Maximus, although Ammianus does not explicitly state this.

9. Stewart Irvin Oost, "Count Gildo and Theodosius the Great," *Classical Philology* 52 (January 1952): 27-30; Elton, "Defining Romans and Barbarians," 131-5.

10. Ammianus 29.5.6.

11. Ammianus 29.5.21-4.

12. Ammianus 29.5.1-56.

13. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies*, 64-5; Barbara Saylor Rodgers, "Merobaudes and Maximus in Gaul," *Historia* 30 (1981): 82-105.

14. Ammianus 31.12.1-17; 31.13.1-19.

15. Ammianus 31.4-14.; Zosimus 4.20-24; Burns, *Barbarians Within the Gates*, 1-91.

16. The exact date of Maximus' appointment in Britain is unknown, but he is attested as the general repulsing the Pictish and Scottish invasion of 381 by the Gallic Chronicler of 452. *Chronica Gallica 452* no.7 in *Monumenta Germania Historica Auctorum Antiquissimorum* 9, ed. T. Mommsen (Berlin, 1892, repr. Berlin, 1961); Roberts, "Magnus Maximus," 30-5.

17. Pearce, *Roman Imperial Coinage: Vol. 9 Valentinian I to Theodosius I*, eds. Harold Mattingly, C.H.V. Sutherland, and R.A.G. Carson (London, 1972), 1-2.

18. Ralph W. Mathisen, "Fourth Century Roman Imperial Types," *Journal for the Society of Ancient Numismatics* 3 no.1 (1971-2): 12-5.

19. Zosimus 4.35.3-4; *Chronica Gallica 452* nos. 6-7; Roberts, "Magnus Maximus," 36-62.

20. Zosimus 4.35.2-4. Translation from Ronald T. Ridley, *Zosimus: New History* (Sydney, 1982).

21. Gratian's war against the Alamanni are attested to by the fifth century historians Socrates and Sozomen. Socrates, *Ecclesiasticae historjae*, 5.11 in *Patrologiae Graecae* 67 ed. J.P. Migne (Paris, 1864); Sozomen, *Ecclesiasticae historiae*, 7.13 in *Patrologiae Graecae* 67 ed. J.P. Migne (Paris, 1864).

22. Zosimus 35.4.5-6; Roberts, "Magnus Maximus," 44-60.

23. Roberts, "Magnus Maximus,"77-8.

24. Rodgers, "Merobaudes and Maximus," 82-105.

25. Zosimus 4.37.1-3.

26. Ambrose, *Epistulae* 24.4 in *Patrologia Latina* 16, ed. J.P. Migne (Paris, 1860).

27. Orosius, *Adversus paganos historiarum libri septem*, 7.35.4 in *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinarum* 5, ed. Z. Zangemeister (Vienna, 1882).

28. Ambrose, *Ep.* 24.4-6.

29. Zosimus 4.37.3. For more on Valentinian II and Theodosius I's acceptance of Maximus as an emperor see Roberts, "Magnus Maximus," 63-9.

30. Gregory of Tours, *Decem libri historiarum*, 2.9 in *Monumenta Germania Historica Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 1.1, eds. B. Krusch and W. Levison (Hanover, 1951).

31. Zosimus 4.45.3.

32. Pacatus, *Panegyricus Latini Pacati Deprani dictus Theodosio*, 45.5 in *Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, eds. C.E.V. Nixon and Barbara Saylor Rodgers (Berkeley, 1994).

Anianus of Orléans and the Barbarians at the Gates

The fall of the Roman empire in the West was a gradual process, punctuated by a series of military and political setbacks for Rome. The fifth century witnessed the culmination of this decline when the last of the Western emperors, Julius Nepos, was murdered in 480 A.D. Prior to this collapse, one of the greatest threats to the security of the empire was Attila the Hun's invasion of Gaul -- modern-day France -- in 451 A.D.. Had Attila been successful, the empire in the West might have fallen thirty years earlier and much more dramatically. The Roman general Aëtius crushed the Huns in two battles, first breaking off Attila's siege of the city of Orléans and then defeating him at a place called the Catalaunian Plain -- modern Chalons. But these critical engagements have been little understood by modern scholars, because the four sources that report them *seem* to conflict with one another in their accounts.[1] Actually, they do not necessarily conflict at all. This paper is a study of how these sources can be reconciled. I propose first to give a general outline of the events. I will then give the sources for the siege of Orléans and the Battle of Chalons and point out where they have caused confusion. Finally, I will suggest a new reading of the sources which gives a plausible reconstruction of the sequence of events.

By the fifth century the Huns had built an empire in Asia and were expanding into Europe. Attila, the leader of the Huns, known as the "Scourge of God" by later writers, had designs on the Roman Empire. Honoria, the sister of the western emperor Valentinian III, appealed to Attila to rescue her from a forced marriage. The Hun agreed, but he assumed that Honoria really desired to marry him instead. So he promptly invaded the Western empire to claim his prospective bride. His ultimate target was the imperial capital of Ravenna, in Italy.

In the spring of 451 A.D., Attila and his army of Huns crossed into Gaul, sacking cities as they went. Finally they came to the city of Orléans, on the river Loire. The strategic position of this city for Attila's campaign cannot be overemphasized. It was one of the principal trading posts on the Loire, and one of the main arteries to the South. If Attila were able to take it, Southern Gaul and Italy would lie open to his army and he would have a clear path to the imperial capital.

A report of the Huns' advance preceded them and the cities in the western parts of Gaul, including Paris, Troyes and Orléans, had sufficient time to arrange for their defense.[2] Anianus, the bishop of Orléans, traveled quickly to Arles, in southern Gaul, to request the help of the Roman general Aëtius, who was responsible for the protection of Gaul. Anianus returned to the city and the inhabitants prepared for a siege. Attila soon arrived at Orléans, which he attacked. There, the Huns were confronted by the general Aëtius and an army of barbarian troops, which included Franks and a large group of Visigoths led by their king Theodoric I. Attila retreated East as far as Troyes, to the plain near Chalons. There Aëtius managed to defeat Attila and destroy the empire of the Huns, ending this threat to the Roman empire.

Four sources mention the siege of Orléans. The first two of these were written roughly one hundred years after the event, in the late sixth century. Gregory, bishop of Tours, recorded the siege in his *History of the Franks*.[3] Jordanes, writing in Constantinople in the eastern half of the Roman Empire, mentioned the siege in his work on the Goths, known as the *Getica*.[4] Both these accounts seem to conflict not only with each other but also with those of the remaining two sources. The Life of Anianus, bishop of Orléans, was written in the late fifth or early sixth century and gives the fullest account of the siege. Finally, we possess a letter about the siege, written toward the end of the fifth century by Sidonius Apollinaris, bishop of Clermont, to a certain Prosper, bishop of Orléans.[5]

Modern scholars, in attempting to deal with the apparent conflicts in these four sources, have emphasized one or another of them as giving the more accurate account of the siege. This has led to the regrettable practice of calling the veracity of the other sources into question, or, worse still, ignoring them entirely. The pretext for this is that certain types of sources are *a priori* more valuable than others: histories, chronicles and letters are considered more accurate than hagiography. Of the sources presented here, The Life of Anianus is a hagiographical work and Gregory of Tours' account derives from another biography of Anianus. In addition, the Life of Anianus has been discounted as a source because it was long thought to date from the ninth century;[6] recent studies have shown that the work was in fact written in the late fifth or early sixth century.[7] While hagiography is admittedly sometimes more vague with regard to detail than a historical account, this is no reason to discount the source, especially in a period where so few are available. All sources from antiquity require careful reading, with suitable regard to peculiarities of genre or origin. Taking these into account, along with the inherent biases of each source, the elements of these four sources which have caused the trouble can be reconciled so as to render a more complete picture of the siege than any presented to date. The stories the sources tell and the points where the conflicts occur are as follows.

The Life of Anianus gives the only sketch of the events which led up to the siege. It tells us that the people of Orléans had become alarmed by reports of Hunnic incursions into Gaul, probably brought to Orléans by refugees from cities sacked by the Huns. The bishop of Orléans, Anianus, traveled to Arles to request the help of Aëtius, who was then serving as *magister utriusque militiae*,[8] the highest military office in the western half of the Roman empire. Aëtius agreed to come to Orléans with his army, a motley collection of barbarian groups who were obligated to fight for Rome. Anianus returned to the city. He ordered the gates and "other openings" to be shut,[9] and the inhabitants retreated behind the walls of the city in anticipation of an attack by the Huns.

At this point the other sources enter the picture. Jordanes informs us that a king of one of the barbarian groups residing in Gaul had decided to hand the city of Orléans over to the Huns. Sangibanus, king of the Alans, was under treaty with Rome to protect the city and its environs, but his fear of Attila caused him to attempt to save himself by betraying the city.[10] Presumably, Sangibanus thought that Attila was likely to be successful in taking over Gaul, and hoped to persuade him of the Alans' friendly intentions. The king recognized that the city of Orléans would have offered Attila a strategic base in his invasion of Gaul. The mention of Sangibanus and the presence of the Alans in connection with this affair occurs only in Jordanes' *Getica*.[11] It is worthwhile, therefore, to place the Alans in context here.

By the fifth century, it had become a common policy for Rome to grant large tracts of land to barbarian groups in return for the promise of military service as needed. The empire had been forced to make these concessions to the barbarians due to increasing military pressure on the frontiers and to the barbarians' demands for land within the borders of the empire. One of these barbarian groups settled by Rome within the frontiers was the Alans. A Gallic chronicler states that the Alans were settled in Gaul in two separate locations. One group, under their leader Sambida, was situated "in the deserted counrtyside of the city of Valence," on the Rhône River, in 440 A.D.. This group may have been placed at this site by Aëtius.[12]

The second group of Alans was certainly settled by Aëtius, in a region known only as "Gallia ulterior," or "Farther Gaul," in about 442 A.D.. It is this same area which had seceded from the Roman empire in about 435 A.D. under a group of bandits known as the Bacaudae, under their leader Tibatto.[13] It may be that the Alans were settled in this area to prevent further outbreaks of this kind. The Gallic chronicler states that the latter settlement was resisted by the local inhabitants and was subdued by the Alans with force, which was apparently approved by Aëtius. There are several indications that the area referred to in connection with this settlement, "Gallia ulterior," included the vicinity of Orléans.[14] Many

place names in the area, for example Allaines, Allainville, and Alaincourt, are clearly derived from the word *Alanus*.

A life of Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, also tells us that in about 445 A.D. the bishop had a run-in with the Alans in Gallia ulterior.[15] Germanus persuaded Goar, who preceded Sangibanus as king of the Alans, to put off an attack authorized by Aëtius against the Armoricans. These Armoricans, who had a history of revolts against the Roman empire, lived in the area now called Brittany.[16] If Aëtius had settled the Alans to keep the Armoricans under control, the Loire valley north of Orléans would have served as an excellent base for them, because it lay between Armorica and the rest of Gaul.[17] Finally, Jordanes explicitly states that Sangibanus was residing at Orléans at the time of the Hunnic attack.[18]

Both these kings of the Alans, Goar and Sangibanus, held military commands under the Roman government. Goar was certainly deployed at least once, against the Armoricans. It may be that the Alans, having been settled in the Loire valley, had remained there even after the Armoricans had ceased to cause concern to Rome. If Jordanes is correct, Sangibanus and his Alans were in the vicinity of Orléans at the time of the Huns' attack on the city. The city itself may have been used as their base of operations. Certainly if Sangibanus was in a position to hand the city over to Attila, he had control over it and free access to it. It is quite possible that when the inhabitants of Orléans shut themselves up inside the city walls in preparation for the arrival of the Huns, the Alans were sequestered inside along with them.

It is in the account of the siege itself that the sources are most divergent. Jordanes states that Aëtius and Theodoric arrived at Orléans, discovered Sangibanus' plan to hand the city over to the Huns, and began to fortify it in anticipation of a Hunnic attack. When Attila arrived and saw these preparations, he decided to withdraw to the Catalaunian Plain rather than engage Aëtius' army at the city.[19] Because Jordanes seems to imply that Aëtius arrived before the Huns reached Orléans, it has been assumed that, in his version of events, the siege never occurred at all.

The other sources tell a different story. Gregory of Tours, Sidonius Apollinaris, and the Life of Anianus all clearly state that Attila arrived at the city before Aëtius and his Visigoths, and proceeded to attack it. Both Gregory and the Life of Anianus say that Attila besieged the city with battering rams. But here again the story diverges. Gregory declares that Aëtius relieved the city before it was taken, just when the walls were about to give way.[20] Aëtius and the Visigoths then drove the Huns off, and pursued them to the Catalaunian Plain.

Sidonius Apollinaris and the Life of Anianus, however, state that Huns got into the city before the arrival of Aëtius. The letter of Sidonius is clearly a response to a request made by Prosper, Anianus' successor as bishop of Orléans, to write an account of the siege and commemorate the brave deeds of Anianus in connection with it. Sidonius' letter, then, probably repeats verbatim what Bishop Prosper had written to him of the siege. Sidonius, echoing Prosper, says that the city was besieged ("oppugnatio"), broken into ("inruptio") but not plundered ("nec direptio") by the Huns. The use of the word *inruptio*, a "bursting in", implies that some Huns broke into the city. This could be the result of a breach of the walls by one of the battering rams. Gregory of Tours is quite clear that the walls were crumbling under their impact. Finally, the Life of Anianus seems to contradict Sidonius' statement that the Huns had *broken* in by claiming that, following a protracted attack on the city walls, the inhabitants of the city voluntarily opened the gates to the leaders -- called "proceres" -- of the Huns.[21]

In what way can all these conflicts be reconciled? In the following account I will trace a sequence of events which not only includes all of these four sources as equally valid, but is the most plausible version of the events presented so far.

When the first reports of the Huns' invasion of Gaul in the spring of 451 A.D. reached Orléans, Bishop Anianus went to Arles to ask Aëtius for help. He returned to the city, and everyone, including the Alans under Sangibanus, withdrew into the city and prepared for a siege. It is quite evident that Sangibanus and his Alans lacked sufficient numbers to engage the Huns on their own. The king could not

hope to fulfill his obligation to protect the city without help, and his only recourse was to shut himself up inside the city and pray along with the inhabitants for reinforcements to arrive.

Attila reached Orléans in mid-June and proceeded to attack the city walls with battering rams. The walls were severely damaged in the attack, and the inhabitants, according to both Gregory of Tours and the Life of Anianus, despaired of any salvation. There were undoubtedly breaches made in the walls, which would explain Sidonius' "inruptio," and which would have added to the panic of the citizens. At this point, the Life of Anianus states that the bishop, possibly under pressure from Sangibanus, made an excursion outside the city to the camp of Attila. Anianus evidently was commissioned to negotiate the surrender of the city to the Huns. And, as a result of this embassy, the siege was lifted for a period of three or four days.

At this point, Attila seems to have withdrawn from the area with the majority of his army, leaving a small guard and a group of negotiators, the *proceres*, who would organize the surrender of the city. The gates were opened, and these "proceres" were allowed in, where they began to divide up the spoils. Aëtius and his Visigothic army arrived at this moment, attacking the Huns who remained around Orléans. The presence of the Hunnic negotiators would explain Aëtius' suspicion of treachery on the part of Sangibanus. Jordanes tells us the general found out that Sangibanus had planned to violate his treaty with Rome by handing the city over to the Huns. Aëtius kept the king under a close guard after this plot was discovered. Sangibanus and his Alans were still used by Aëtius in the subsequent battle at Chalons, but were positioned between the Roman and Visigothic forces; this disadvantageous position was forced upon Sangibanus both to punish him and to prevent his possible desertion to the Huns.

It is *this* phase of the siege that Jordanes' account, which had previously been the most difficult one to reconcile with the others, refers to. It is clear that Attila returned to Orléans to check on the negotiations after the arrival of Aëtius and his army. When he saw the Romans in possession of the city, he took council and decided to withdraw to a site more favorable to his own army. The Huns retreated to the Catalaunian Plain, followed by Aëtius. The Romans won a spectacular victory and broke the power of the Huns, ending their threat to the Western Empire.

So the apparent conflicts in the accounts of Gregory of Tours, Jordanes, Sidonius Apollinaris, and the Life of Anianus become, in this view, mere differences in focus. Each author chose to concentrate on a particular segment of the siege. The reasons for this are not hard to explain, once the authors' particular viewpoints are taken into account.

It makes sense for Jordanes to have spent more time on the battle of Chalons than the details of the siege at Orléans. The later conflict was far more decisive for the Romans, the Huns and the Goths (in whom Jordanes was most interested). The fate of a single Gallic city cannot have been of much importance to Jordanes, who was writing in Constantinople a century later. Gregory of Tours, because he was writing a history of the Franks who had settled in Gaul, wanted to report the history of Gaul more or less as a whole. He therefore gives roughly equal emphasis to the siege of Orléans and the subsequent battle at the Catalaunian Plain. Sidonius Apollinaris, by contrast, had been specifically requested by Prosper to write an account of Bishop Anianus' organization of the defense of Orléans. Likewise, the author of the Life of Anianus was concerned with Anianus' role in the affair. Neither would wish, after giving so much emphasis to the bishop's heroics attempts to save the city, to then detract from him by mentioning that it was really General Aëtius' exploits at Chalons that saved the day for the Romans. As a consequence, both these authors record the siege and ignore the later developments.

A careful analysis of not only what the sources say, but also of the contexts in which they were written, allows us to assemble a comprehensible narrative for the siege of Orléans and the battle on the Catalaunian Plain. No single account need take precedence over or invalidate the others. We can now fully account for another segment of the history of the fall of the Roman empire in the West, which occurred scarcely thirty years after the Huns were defeated by Aëtius at the battle of Chalons.

Endnotes

[1] See, for example, André Loyen, "Le rôle de Saint Aignan dans la defense d'Orléans," *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Comptes Rendus de Séances de l'Année 1969* (Paris): 64-74; Emilienne Demougeot, "Attila et les Gaules," *Bulletin de la Société d'Agriculture, Commerce, Sciences et Arts de la Marne* 73 (1959): 7-41; Ulf Täckholm, "Aëtius and the Battle of the Catalaunian Fields," *Opuscula Romana* 7 (1969): 259-276; E. A. Thompson, *The Huns* (Oxford, 1948; revised, 1996), 153-4; Ferdinand Lot, *Les destinées de l'Empire en Occident* (Paris, 1940), 67; Pierre Courcelle, "Une ' ' chez Gregoire de Tours," *Revue des Études Latines* (Paris, 1970), 209-13.

[2] *Vita Aniani episcopi Aurelianensis,* ed. Bruno Krusch, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica [M.G.H.], Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum [S.R.M.]* 3, 108-107. This *vita* is *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina* 473. *Vita Genovefae virginis Parisiensis,* ed. Bruno Krusch, *M.G.H., S.R.M.* 3, 104-138.

[3] 2.7. Ed. Bruno Krusch, *M.G.H., S.R.M.* 1.1.

[4] *De origine actibusque Getarum,* ed. Theodor Mommsen, *M.G.H., Auctores Antiquissimi [A.A.]* 5.1.

[5] *Ep.* 8.15. Ed. Theodor Mommsen, *M.G.H., A.A.* 8.

[6] Bruno Krusch, in his introduction to the *Vita*, claimed that it was written in the Carolingian period.

[7] See Loyen, "Le rôle de Saint Aignan."

[8] *Vita Aniani* I, 7. Aëtius, s.v. Fl. Aëtius 7, *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, Volume 2: A.D. 395-527 [P.L.R.E. II]*, ed. J. R. Martindale (Cambridge, 1980).

[9] "Sanctus Anianus portarum repagula iussit offirmari et cetera." *Vita Aniani I,* 8.

[10] "Sangibanus namque rex Alanorum metu futurorum perterritus Attilae se tradere pollicetur et Aurelianam civitatem Galliae, ubi tunc consistebat, in eius iura transducere." *Getica,* 194-195.

[11] 194-5.

[12] "Deserta Valentinae urbis rura Alanis, quibus Sambida praeerat, partienda traduntur." *Chronica Gallica a. 452,* ed. Theodor Mommsen, *M.G.H., Chronica Minora* 9. This Sambida has been tentatively identified with Sangibanus; *P.L.R.E. II,* s.v. Sangibanus.

[13] "Gallia Ulterior Tibattonem principem rebellionis secuta a Romana societate discessit, a quo tracto initio omnia paena Galliarum servitia in Bacaudam conspiravere." *Gall. Chron.*

Physicians, Sorcerers, and Saints in Merovingian Gaul

During Late Antiquity people from Gaul (modern France) who fell victim to injury or illness could choose between a variety of medical practitioners. Three kinds of healers as they were identified in the sources, especially historical and hagiographical material, of Merovingian Gaul were physicians, sorcerers, and saints. This study proposes to describe each of the three and examine the lengths to which the socially dominant local clergies went to thwart rival healers and to promote their own healing heroes--the saints.

Physicians

The first kind of healer in Merovingian Gaul was the doctor--the physician. This sort of medical practitioner went well back into antiquity.[1] Famous examples include Hippocrates from fifth-century BC Greece and Galen from the Roman Empire in the second century AD. Members of this profession active in Late Antiquity are easily distinguishable from other healers mentioned in the sources. Merovingian authors used two Latin terms to indicate a physician--*medicus*, which means a doctor in general, and *archiater*. The latter term was used during the Late Roman Empire and into the sixth century to connote a state appointed physician, usually a municipal doctor or an imperial or royal doctor.[2]

Physicians of Late Antiquity possessed distinguishing characteristics regarding their methods of medical treatment, preference of patient, and social and economic status. First, doctors were differentiated from other healers by the kind of medicine that they practiced. For example, physicians alone were depicted in the sources performing surgeries and bloodlettings.[3] Furthermore, physicians were presented as being wealthy people who preferred to attend to wealthy patients. Narratives of doctors in action depict them caring for influential people, such as kings, bishops and counts. For example, in his *History of the Franks*, Gregory of Tours mentioned two *medici*, Donatus and Nicholas, who served Queen Austrechildis, and the *archiater*, Marileifus, who cared for King Chilperic.[4] Similarly, a physician named Armentarius attended the bishop Gregory.[5]

The sources also suggest that the physicians of Late Antiquity themselves possessed considerable social and economic status. There are numerous examples of doctors from the Late Roman Empire who were of noble lineage. For example, in the fourth century, the physician, Ausonius of Bordeaux, was a descendent from a noble Druidic family in Gaul.[6] In the early sixth century, Helpidius of Bordeaux was a physician and a deacon who held the title of *vir inlustris*, which made him senatorial rank.[7] For Merovingian Gaul, Gregory of Tours described King Chilperic's doctor, Marileifus, as a man of great wealth, despite his having risen from servile origins. In fact, Marileifus had so much wealth that one Merovingian king (Guntram) twice sent men to rob the doctor on the highway.[8]

Sorcerers

The second kind of healer in Merovingian Gaul, as ecclesiastical authorities identified them, was the sorcerer. Gallic authors commonly referred to these popular healers as *harioli* (soothsayers), because they sometimes performed divinations in addition to employing arcane healing arts. As with physicians, the occupation of popular healer was a centuries-old profession, practiced in Greek, Roman and Celtic cultures.[9]

[14] B. S. Bachrach declares that the Alan king "Goar settled a substantial number of his followers in the Orléanais and the area to the north and personally moved his own capital to the city of Orléans," but his claim is very insecurely based upon the term "Gallia ulterior" in the Gallic Chronicle. There is no specific reference to Orléans or any other city. *A History of the Alans in the West, from Their First Appearance in the Sources of Classical Antiquity through the Early Middle Ages* (Minneapolis, 1973), 63.

[15] Various dates have been proposed for this event, ranging from 437 to 448. E. A. Thompson has asserted 437, but his claim is very insecurely supported. *Saint Germanus of Auxerre and the End of Roman Britain* (Woodbridge, 1984). For dates of 445 and later, see R. W. Mathisen, "The Last Year of Saint Germanus of Auxerre: Some Recent Suggestions," in *Studies in the History, Literature and Society of Late Antiquity* (Amsterdam, 1991), 125-135.

[16] *Vita Germani episcopi Autessiodurensis,* 28. Ed. Bruno Krusch, *M.G.H., S.R.M.* 7, 247-283.

[17] Bachrach claims that Aëtius' intent was to use the Alans "to help control the *bacaudae* of Armorica." *A History of the Alans,* 64. J. F. Drinkwater concurs: "...the strong impression given by the ... sources that deal with the Bacaudae, either directly or indirectly, is one of continuing disobedience to Roman rule, and a strong inclination to act on their own, or in their own interests, on the part of the inhabitants of Aremorica virtually throughout the fifth century." "The Bacaudae of Fifth-Century Gaul," in J. F. Drinkwater and H. Elton, eds., *Fifth-Century Gaul: A Crisis of Identity?* (Cambridge, 1992), 215.

[18] "Aurelianam civitatem Galliae, ubi tunc consistebat." The verb "consistebat" could suggest that Sangibanus had merely halted at Orléans on his way somewhere, but the use of the imperfect implies a more prolonged stay there. *Getica,* 194.

[19] "...magnis aggeribus eandem urbem ante adventum Attilae struunt." *Getica,* 195-197.

[20] "...trementibus ab impetu arietum muris iamque ruituris." *HF,* 2.7.

[21] "...portis reseratis, Chunorum proceris civitatem introissent." *Vita Aniani I,* 10.

The sources of Late Antiquity reveal that successive generations of popular healers were persons of decreasing privilege and status. Most of the so-called *harioli* of the Merovingian period numbered among the less-privileged of society. For example, one sorcerer who traveled about Gaul healing people, when he was finally apprehended, turned out to be a fugitive slave.[10] The most commonly described medical methods of popular healers were applying poultices, distributing magical amulets, and dispensing potions and salves. For example, the above-mentioned *hariolus* dispensed what he claimed to be holy oil.[11] While wealthy and influential people sometimes consulted sorcerers, their patients were usually less-privileged persons such as peasants. For example, Bishop Gregory describes with no small amount of disdain one such healer who appeared in 587:

> In that year there appeared in Tours a man called Desiderius, who gave it out that he was a very important person, pretending that he was able to work miracles. ... I myself was not there, so the country folk flocked to him in crowds, bringing with them the blind and the infirm. He set out to deceive them by the false art of necromancy, rather than to cure them by God's grace. Those who were paralyzed or disabled by some other infirmity he ordered to be stretched forcibly, as if he could restore by his own brute strength men whom he was unable to cure by the intervention of divine power. Some of his helpers would seize a patient's hands and some would tug at other parts of his body, until it seemed that his sinews would snap. Those who were not cured his servants sent away half dead. The result was that many gave up the ghost under his treatment.[12]

Saints

The final variety of healer was a relative newcomer to the field--the saint--a product of the Christian religion which increasingly dominated European society throughout Late Antiquity.[13] Most of the surviving literature from Merovingian Gaul is hagiography--saints' lives--that is, stories about the lives and miracles of saints.[14] Thus it should come as no surprise that the kind of healer most often described in Merovingian sources is the saint.

It was not unheard of for living persons to be considered holy, but such individuals were rare in western Late Antiquity.[15] One such living saint was Monegundis. She was a noble woman from Chartres who claimed the ability to heal. Her methods included laying on hands and anointing patients with her saliva. Monegundis abandoned home and established a small monastery for women in the basilica of Saint Martin at Tours, where she miraculously cured people who came to her cell.[16]

However, most saints in the West in Late Antiquity were dead holy people. They were former Christian martyrs, confessors, monks, and bishops. They were buried in tombs in churches often dedicated to them. Many or most people of this age believed that these dead saints possessed the ability to send divine power from beyond the grave in order to heal the living.[17] As example, here is a typical depiction of a person being healed at the tomb of one of Gaul's preeminent saints, Martin:

> From Bourges came two blind men whose eyelids were withered and obscured by a sticky discharge; they knelt and prayed at the feet of the blessed lord [that is, at the tomb of Saint Martin]. This happened on the day of his festival [July 4, 576]; and in the presence of the congregation, while the miracle stories were being read from his *Vita*, a flash similar to a lightning bolt flared over the men. The bonds that blocked their eyelids were broken, blood flowed from their eyes, their sight was completely clear, and they saw everything.[18]

Despite their medicinal faculties, dead saints could not sufficiently promote themselves as divine healers without earthly assistance. So it is important also to consider those who benefited from the

encouragement of saints as healers--the local clerics, particularly bishops. During Late Antiquity bishops tended to be the most powerful figures in local communities throughout the west and including Gaul.[19] One way that bishops maintained authority over their communities was by promoting saints as powerful patrons of their cities and surrounding territories. For example, in the stories that Gregory of Tours wrote about Martin, the bishop described the saint performing hundreds of spectacular miracles--freeing prisoners from jail, ransoming hostages, and, of course, healing people. Gregory's clergy read these miracles stories at church services during biannual festivals dedicated to Martin.[20] But beyond this, Gregory promoted the healing power of Saint Martin by taking the show on the road--that is, by using relics of the saint to heal afflicted people upon whom he came. Relics were usually items which had come in contact with the saint's holy resting place--linen cloths, curtains, but especially, dust scraped from a tomb. Gregory carried tomb dust everywhere he went. He dispensed the holy medication to distressed persons of every class. Here's a common example as told by Gregory:

> While I was staying with the king [Childebert II], one of his royal clerks, Claudius, was afflicted with a fever. When he was so ill from this fever that he rejected food and drink, he asked me what he was suffering. When he drank the dust that I had taken from the holy tomb of the blessed [Martin] for my safety and that I mixed [in water], soon his fever vanished and he was healed.[21]

As with other ecclesiastics who promoted saint's cults, Gregory had much to gain from the practice. Since he was the u'timate authority over the basilica of Saint Martin where the dead saint lay, Gregory was Martin's principal living representative. When the saint's prestige increased, Gregory's prestige and authority over the community increased, too. All of the people healed at the tomb of Saint Martin, influenced by the lingering Roman social custom of patronage, considered themselves bound to the saint as his client. Being indebted to the saint, they also became indebted to the saint's church. They owed loyalty, respect, service, whatever, to that church. They might be expected to attend services there--they might be called upon to defend the church against physical assault, or they might even be called upon to defend the saint's living representative, the bishop, against attack from his political enemies. In Late Antiquity the success of a saint's cult commonly was proportional to the influence and authority that a bishop could wield over the townspeople and the surrounding inhabitants. Therefore, it was incumbent upon bishops promoting saint's cults to encourage people to believe that the local saint was the powerful healer of the community. So what about the competition?

Conclusion

Since physicians were healers, might not the ecclesiastical establishment view them as contenders of the holy healers? The answer is yes. Gregory of Tours, in particular, sometimes belittled physicians and their methods of medical practice in his writings. For example, after describing how Saint Martin once cured a deacon of cataracts, Gregory offered this about physicians:

> What [cure] such as this one have doctors ever accomplished with their implements? Their efforts produce more pain than healing; and after stretching and piercing an eye with their needles they fashion the torments of death before they open the eye. If caution is lacking in this operation, the doctor provides eternal blindness for the wretched patient. But the implement of the blessed confessor [Martin] is his affection, and his ointment is simply his power.[22]

Certain modern historians have cited passages such as this in order to suggest that Gregory and other high ecclesiastics in Gaul were so concerned about physicians as threats to holy healers that they became vehemently hostile to the profession.[23] But this would be taking it too far. Rather, this excerpt is a

literary model presented to encourage readers in the veneration of Saint Martin. If Gregory were really out to get doctors, he could do much more than write diatribes against them. Besides, elsewhere in Gregory's works, one finds evidence that the bishop of Tours had considerable regard for the profession. First of all, Gregory revealed that he himself frequented physicians. He described how he once underwent a bloodletting to relieve a headache.[24] Second, the Bishop of Tours sometimes recorded successful treatments by physicians. For example, when Gregory described how a priest once was beaten nearly to death, he concluded the story by writing that "he would have died had the doctors not arrived with their cupping-glasses."[25]

Gregory and other Merovingian ecclesiastics considered those whom they called sorcerers as a greater source of competition for the holy healers. I must point out here that the Bishop of Tours did not deny that sorcerers had the ability to heal. Gregory was as confident that magic potions could heal as he was that the necklace worn around his own neck containing dust from the tomb of Saint Martin held a powerful curative. Gregory was equally convinced, however, that sorcerers received their powers from diabolic sources.

Just how did he and others ecclesiastics make this distinction in source? Dead saints were promoted by respectable ecclesiastics--persons of high social rank, aristocrats, bishops. They recognized themselves and their deceased healers as promoters of social order. Even the few living persons recognized as saints were generally nobles willing to place themselves under episcopal control, just as Monegundis had done when she settled down in the basilica of Saint Martin. Sorcerers were from the ranks of the socially less-privileged, however. They might encourage peasants and commoners to wander about with them. They were a source of disorder. Besides, unlike the physicians, they appealed to the very potential pool of patients that saints most commonly healed, the less-privileged. Thus, the powerful ecclesiastics recognized these healers as representatives of chaos who threatened the very society that they were attempting to increasingly control.

In regards to the reactions of society's elite persons to sorcerers, one ought to note the lenient treatment proffered. For his misdeeds, the above-mentioned fugitive slave turned sorcerer was temporarily imprisoned and, ultimately, restored to his master who forgave him.[26] Execution was not out of the question for *harioli*--especially, say, for one who might claim to be the resurrected Christ.[27] But in general, relatively mild punishments of temporary confinement or relocation were in order for such offenders. One finds these penalties to be extremely lenient when one considers the atmosphere of chaos and violence that otherwise permeated Gallic society in the Merovingian age.

ENDNOTES

1. For doctors and medicine in Classical Antiquity, see, e. g., Ralph Jackson, *Doctors and Disease in the Roman Empire* (Norman, OK, 1988); Valerie Nutton, "*Archiatri* and the Medical Profession in Antiquity," *Papers of the British School at Rome* 45 (1977): 191-226; John Scarborough, *Roman Medicine* (Ithaca, NY, 1969); Owsei Temkin and C. Lilian Temkin, eds., *Ancient Medicine: Selected Papers of Ludwig Edelstein*, trans. by C. Lilian Temkin (Baltimore, 1967).

2. O. M. Dalton, *The History of the Franks by Gregory of Tours*, v. 1, *Introduction* (London, 1927), 417. For doctors in the early Middle Ages, see Loren MacKinney, *Early Medieval Medicine* (Baltimore, 1937); Fay Dwelle, "Medicine in Merovingian and Carolingian Gaul," unpublished PhD diss. (Chapel Hill, NC, 1934).

3. MacKinney, *Early Medieval Medicine*, 31, 38-40. Gregory of Tours mentions *medici* applying cupping-glasses. For the works of Gregory of Tours I have referred to the following editions: B. Krusch and W. Levison, eds., *Gregorii Episcopi Turonensis Libri Decem Historiarum, Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum 1.1 (2nd ed., Hannover, 1951), hereafter cited Greg. Tur., *Historiae* (*MGH*, SRM 1.1); and B. Krusch, ed., *Gregorii Episcopi Turonensis Miracula et Opera Minora, Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum 1.2 (Hannover, 1885), hereafter cited Greg. Tur., followed by the particular saint's life, (*MGH*, SRM 1.2). For Gregory on doctors and bloodletting, see Greg. Tur., *Historiae* 6.15, 7.22.

4. Patients of physicians in Gregory of Tours' works include bishops, Greg. Tur., *Historiae* 5.5; priests, *Historiae* 7.22; kings 5.35, 8.31, and a count, Greg. Tur., *Liber in gloria martyris* 84. For Marileifus, see Greg. Tur., *Historiae* 5.14, 7.25. For additional evidence of the relatively high status of doctors in Late Antiquity, see R. C. Blockley, "Doctors as Diplomats in the Sixth Century A.D.," *Florilegium* 2 (1980): 89-100.

5. Greg. Tur., *Libri IV de virtutibus beati Martini episcopi* 2.1.

6. For Ausonius of Bordeaux, see Aline Rouselle, "From Sanctuary to Miracle-Worker: Healing in Fourth-Century Gaul," in R. Forster and O. Ranum, eds., *Ritual, Religion, and the Sacred*, Selections from the *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilizations* 7, trans. by E. Forster (Baltimore and London, 1982): 95-127, in particular, 103-05; and M. K. Hopkins, "Social Mobility in the Later Roman Empire: The Evidence of Ausonius," *Classical Quarterly* 11 (1961): 239-49.

7. J. R. Martindale, ed., *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, v. 2, *395-527* (Cambridge, 1980), 537, q. v. "Helpidius 6".

8. Greg. Tur., *Historiae* 7.25 (*MGH*, SRM 1.1, 344-35): "Marileifum vero, qui primus medicorum in domo Chilperici regis habitus fuerat, ardentissime vallant; et qui iam a Gararico duce valde spoliatus fuerat, ab his iterum denudatur, ita ut nulla ei substantia remaneret. Equos quoque eius, aurum argentumque sive species, quas meliores habebat, pariter auferentes, ipsum ditioni aeclesiasticae subdiderunt. Servitium enim patris eius tale fuerat, ut molinas aeclesiasticas studeret, fratresque ac consubrini vel reliqui parentes colinis dominicis adque pistrino subiecti erant."

9. A recent study on sorcery in classical antiquity is F. Graf, *La magie dans l'Antiquité Greco-Romaine* (Paris, 1994). For sorcery in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, see Peter Brown, "Sorcery, Demons, and the Rise of Christianity from Late Antiquity into the Middle Ages," in M. Douglas, ed., *Witchcraft Confessions and Accusations* (London, 1970), 17-45; and Valerie I. J. Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe* (Princeton, 1991).

10.Greg. Tur., *Historiae* 9.6. For two witches of servile origin, see Greg. Tur.,*Historiae* 7.44 & 9.38.

11. Greg. Tur., *Historiae* 9.6.

12. Greg. Tur., *Historiae* 9.6 (*MGH*, SRM 1.1, 417): "Fuit eo anno in urbe Thoronica Desiderius nomine, qui se magnum quendam esse dicebat, adserens se multa posse facere signa. ... Ad quem, quia praesens non eram, resicotas populi multa confluxerat, deferentes secum caecos et debiles, quos non sanctitate sanare, sed errore nigromantici ingenii quaerebat inludere. Nam hos, qui erant paralitici aut alia inpediti debilitate, iubebat

valide extendi, ut quos virtutis divinae largitione diregere non poterat, quasi per industriam restauraret. Denique adpraehendebant pueri eius manus hominis, alii vero pedes, tractumque diversis in partibus, ita ut nervi potarentur abrumpi, cum non sanarentur, demittebantur exanimis. Unde factum est, ut in hoc supplicio multi spiritum exalarent." Translation by Lewis Thorpe, *Gregory of Tours: The History of the Franks* (Harmondsworth, 1974), 483-84.

13. An excellent, recent study on the rise of Christianity in this period is Judith Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom in Late Antiquity* (Princeton, NJ, 1987).

14. Recent studies on hagiography in Late Antiquity include Raymond Van Dam, *Saints and their Miracles in Late Antique Gaul* (Princeton, NJ, 1993); Jo Anne McNamara, John E. Halborg, and E. Gordon Watley, eds., *Sainted Women of the Dark Ages* (Durham, NC, 1992); Thomas F. X. Noble and Thomas Head, eds., *Soldiers of Christ: Saints and Saints Lives from Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (University Park, PA, 1995), the introduction of which is an exceptionally clear and concise discussion of the topic.

15. Joan M. Petersen, "Dead or Alive? The Holy Man as Healer in East and West in the Late Sixth Century," *Journal of Medieval History* 9 (1983): 91-98, in particular, 97. Furthermore, see Peter Brown, "Eastern and Western Christendom in Late Antiquity: A Parting of the Ways," *Studies in Church History* 13 (Oxford, 1976), 1-24.

16. Greg. Tur., *Liber in gloria confessorum* 24 (*MGH*, SRM 1.2, 313-14): "Apud ipsam vero urbem Turonicam beata Monigundis obiit. Fuit autem ex Carnotino territurio. Quae relinquens tam patriam quam parentes, ad hoc tantum Turonus expetiit, ut orationi vacaret. Per quam Deus crebro miracula ostendere est dignatus. Nam si quis pusulam malam incurrisset, ad eam veniens, orationem precabaturm confestimque illa prosternebatur ad supplicandum Dominum, et collegens folia, cuiuslibet holeris aut pomi, saliva inlinebat, faciensque crucem super ulcus, inponebat folium. Confestimque ita omne venenum evaniscebat, ut nihil dignum leti aerotus ultra perferret. Quartanariis quoque et gulam dolentibus, data benedicta aqua, saepius medebatur." Gregory of Tours offers a fuller treatment of the life of Saint Monegundis in his *Life of the Fathers*; Greg. Tur., *Liber vitae patrum* 19 (*MGH*, SRM 1.2, 286-91).

17. For the cult of the saints in Late Roman and Merovingian Gaul, see, e. g., Peter Brown, *Relics and Status in the Age of Gregory of Tours*, The Stenton Lecture, 1976 (Reading, 1977); and idem, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago, 1981).

18. Greg. Tur., *Libri IV de virtutibus beati Martini episcopi* 2.29 (*MGH*, SRM 1.2, 169-70): "Duo caeci ex Biturgio venientes, arefactis palpebris et glutino coniunctis, ad pedes beati domni orantes decubabant. Factum est autem in die festivitatis duae, adstante populo, dum virtutes de vita illius legerentur, factus est super illos splendor corrusco similis, et confractis ligaturis, quae palpebras obseraverant, defluente ex oculis sanguine, late visu patente, cuncta cernere meruerunt."

19. For the increasing influence and authority of bishops during the Late Roman and Early Middle Ages, see, e. g., Peter Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison, WI, 1992); Georg Schreibelreiter, *Der Bischof in merowingischer Zeit* (Vienna, 1983); Martin Heinzelmann, *Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien: Zur Kontinuität römischer Führungsschichten vom 4. bis zum 7. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1976).

20. The dates for Saint Martin's festivals were and are July 4 and November 11 (his death date).

21. Greg. Tur., *Libri IV de virtutibus beati Martini episcopi* 4.28 (*MGH*, SRM 1.2, 206): "Nobis quoque cum rege morantibus, Claudius quidam ex cancellariis regalibus a febre corripitur. Cumque cibum potumque nimia oppressus febre exhorruisset, nobis quae pariebatur quaestus est, delutumque pulverem, quod de sancto beati sepulchro pro salvatione levavimus, ut hausit, mox conpressa febre, sanatus est."

22. Greg. Tur., *Libri IV de virtutibus beati Martini episcopi* 2.19 (*MGH*, SRM 1.2, 166): "Quid umquam tale fecere cum ferramentis medici, cum plus negotium doloris exserant, quam medellae, cum, distentum transfixumque spiculis oculum, prius mortis tormenta figurant, quam lumen aperiant? In quo si cautela fefellerit, aeternam misero praeparat caecitatem. Huic autem beato confessori voluntas ferramentum est, et sola virtus unguentum." Translation is based on Van Dam, *Saints and their Miracles*, 238.

23. Dalton, *History of the Franks*, I: 418-19.

24. Greg. Tur., *Libri IV de virtutibus beati Martini episcopi* 3.60.

25. Greg. Tur., *Historiae* 7.22 (*MGH*, SRM 1.1, 341): "...et fecessit forsitan, si ei medicorum ventusae non subvenissent."

26. Greg. Tur., *Historiae* 9.6.

27. During an attack of the plague in Gaul in 591, a poor man from Bourges began to travel through southern Gaul pretending to be a cleric. He then claimed that he was Christ and that his female travelling companion, called Mary, was his sister. This man laid hands and healed the people who flocked to him. He also prophesied, and he gathered a following of more than three thousand people, which even included some priests. He robbed people on the road and gave the clothes, gold and silver to the poor. When he approached Le Puy, the bishop of that town sent out his toughs, one of whom slew the false-Christ on the spot with his sword; Greg. Tur., *Historiae* 10.25.

The Planters of St. John's Parish (Colleton):1675-1790

In 1706, the Commons House of Assembly and Lords Proprietors of Carolina, eager to lend prestige to "true" religion and better organize the youthful English colony lying along the coast between Virginia and Florida, agreed by a measure known as the Church Act to give the Church of England official status and prescribe the creation of several parishes. Colleton County, situated south and west of the primary settlement at Charles Town, was organized as two parishes, St. Paul's and St. Bartholomew's. However, the former, spreading over islands and mainland bounded by the Atlantic Ocean and the Stono and South Edisto rivers, proved inconveniently large for religious or civil purposes; by a new act of 1734, the more northerly and seaward section, consisting entirely of islands -- John's, Wadmalaw, Edisto, Kiawah, and Seabrook -- was created a separate district, St. John's Parish (Colleton).

This paper offers a descriptive analysis of the immigrants who came under English auspices to the string of sea islands once known by the geographic administrative name of St. John's Parish and the development of a plantation economy in this small section of South Carolina prior to the American Revolution. The planters of St. John's, distant progenitors (in some cases) of people who still inhabit this place, arrived as groups and individuals, men and women who followed religious visions and pursued material across the great ocean. A religious and ethnic mosaic, they came to espouse a shared identity and interest.

The sea-girt parish was first colonized during the last quarter of the seventeenth century. In 1674-1675, four years before the first house lot was laid out in Charles Town, Dr. Henry Woodward prepared the way by securing on behalf of the Lords Proprietors two treaties with aboriginal residents of the region. The first was an alliance with the Westoes, a fierce interior tribe, and was designed to strengthen England's hand against its imperial rival Spain, whose primary base in the region was St. Augustine, a fort in Florida. The second was intended to reassure old friends, the small tribes the English called the "greater and lessor Cussoe" -- Kiawahs, Stonos, Bohickets, and others -- of English good will and sealed the deal with a trade: "a valuable parcel of cloth, beads, and other goods and manufactures" in return for the area defined by the "River of Kyewah, the River of Stonoe, and the freshes of the River Edistoh" -- the future St. John's, Colleton. A trickle of colonists from across the Atlantic and down the Caribbean flowed in.

The new-comers were diverse, including English members of the State Church and English, Welsh, Scotch, and French "dissenters" of several shades, to say nothing of African-born and descended "servants" who eventually constituted a large majority of the whole population. Through the colonial period and beyond, the district was constantly replenished by immigrants willing to loosen the bonds of family and country to follow the siren calls of self-fulfillment and liberation. Race and success characterized those who became "planters." Although some arrived with wealth and connections, many more were upwardly mobile. Moreover, with ninety-five percent of households holding the wherewithal in land and "servants" to seize a share of prosperity, St. John's, Colleton at the end of its first century approached as closely as a place ever did to a democracy of masters.

Charles Town was their common experience, the first stop of most immigrants and ever after the most important cultural point of reference. Set down in the midst of natural bounty, on the edge of a rich continent, with accessible and non-competitive markets for its most prolific productions, the Carolina Low Country was visibly prosperous by the middle decades of the 1700s. A spirit of materialism and optimism, lives that were "one continual Race in which everyone is endeavoring to distance all behind him; and to overtake or pass by, all before him," defined the world of white townsmen and planters.

Paul Grimball, his wife, and two daughters were the first English settlers of record on Edisto Island. In 1675, Grimball and his dependents, including a number of "servants," set about to carve out a 600-acre plantation at a spot on the North Edisto River described by the name by which it still is known: "Point of Pines." Within a short time, a substantial house of brick and tabby, an improvised mortar made of seashells, rose within an agricultural operation including 70 acres of Indian corn, crops of English peaschoice onions, and tobacco, and 100 "great hogs."

The northern shore of Edisto Island was quickly colonized. The earliest settlers tended to be, like the Grimballs, gentleman farmers, very "substantial men and theire Familyes," the kind who provided executive leadership for the British Empire as long as it endured. Grimball was a long-time Secretary of the Colony; one of his neighbors in the 1680s was "Landgrave" Joseph Morton, himself twice Governor of the Province. As colony officials, they had to reside at Charles Town much of the year, but Edisto Island thirty five miles down the coast seemed a natural as a country retreat which might also be expected to produce a good income. After a Spanish invasion force swept by the North Edisto in 1686, leaving Grimball's and Morton's and five other houses in ruins before being itself scattered by a sudden tropical gale at Charles Town, Morton claimed losses suggesting a lifestyle not popularly associated with frontiers and pioneers: "all his money and plate and 13 slaves . . . eleven mahogany chairs . . . and a couch, a mahogany bookcase . . . a round tea lavee . . . a harpsichord and a pair of Red and Green enameled china bowls." Two decades or a bit more later, between 1710 and 1725, Paul Hamilton, Grimball's son-in-law and himself Secretary of the Colony, constructed the elegant Brick House on the North Edisto,perhaps the first English "manor house" in North America.

Hamilton's arrival on Edisto seems to have been part of a general movement of British subjects to put a bit of water and land between themselves and the Spaniards of Florida following the destruction of Stuart Town, a British colony of Scots "dissenters" at Port Royal, in the same raid that despoiled Grimball and Morton. A map of 1711 shows their places and names like Denis, Whitmarsh, and MacPherson dotting the shores of the South Edisto and Dawhoo. Augmented by a few French Huguenots and Welsh Presbyterians, these folk were soon organized as Christian congregations through the effective missionary work of, among others, William Screven of the Baptist church in Charles Town. By 1700 a Baptist meeting house had been built; Providence Grimball, Ephraim Mikell, and William Fry were among the first communicants whom the founder baptized. Though at first unorganized, Presbyterians were more numerous. After 1700, as Baptists declined in numbers and cohesion, the Grimballs and Mikells defected to the Presbyterians and the Presbyterians took over the Baptists' little wooden meeting house for their own use. Meanwhile, a handful of Anglicans including the Hamiltons, living mostly on the North Edisto River, commuted by water to worship in the high-church style in Charles Town or, after 1742, St. John's, the parish church on John's Island.

In the same year Grimball settled on Edisto Island, a boatload of English Quakers destined for John's Island were announced by a letter from Lord Ashley to his deputy Andrew Percivall at Town:

> There now come in my Dogger [the ship **Edisto**], Jacob Waight and two or three families of those who are called Quakers. These are but **Harbengers** of a greater number that intend to follow. Tis theire purpose to take up a whole colony for themselves and theire Friends here. They promised to build a town of 30 Houses. I have writ to the Gov'r and council about them and directed them to set them out 12,000 acres. I would have you be very kind to them and give them all the assistance you can . . . for they are a people I have a great regard to and am obliged to take care of.

They never settled thickly enough to fashion the "town of 30 houses" anticipated by their patron. However, six or seven Quaker families and individuals with names like Waight, Stanyarne, Beamor, and Hext, perhaps fifty people, settled the flat lands of John's Island and its near neighbor Wadmalaw Island

in the last two decades of the 1600s. In order to prosper in a rural, slaveholding Anglican parish they had to let go of much of their religious and social baggage. They resorted to Indian or black slave labor, although Quakers had been outspoken critics of human servitude, and gotten in trouble for it, on Barbados just a few years before. They paid taxes that supported the Church of England. A Quaker Proprietor without St. John's connections, John Archdale, was pivotal in securing concessions on oaths and militia service and thus completing the process by which the way his co-religionists were reconciled and in the long run Anglicized.

Although the Quakers' first neighbors on John's and Wadmalaw islands included Church of England men like Robert Gibbes, a businessman of England by way of Barbados, and Robert Seabrook, a merchant of County Bedford who apparently engrossed some of his investment capital in unlawful commerce with pirates, the preponderance of the Quakers' near neighbors were other "dissenters." Presbyterian Thomas Jones settled on the lower end of John's before 1680 and by 1700 owned the whole of what would be called Jones, Simmons, and, after 1800, Seabrook Island. About 1680, several families of Presbyterians came with Benjamin Blake, a gentleman of Somersetshire -- brother of the famous Admiral Blake -- huddling together at the meeting point of the Stono and Wadmalaw Rivers on Wadmalaw Island. [Joseph Morton, a "dissenter" himself and husband of Blake's daughter, acquired an estate nearby, just west of an Indian settlement on Bohicket Creek, though he probably never lived there.] The Blake family soon moved outside the area, but before Benjamin's death in 1689 he built two large plantations, Plainsville and Pawlets, into Wadmalaw Island's first substantial economic enterprise, exporting forest products, deer-skins, and cattle to England and the West Indies in exchange for manufactured consumer goods, land, and African slaves.

There were also French Huguenot families in the first wave of settlement, most notably the Legares. Flying from civil and religious persecution from their homes in the Loire valley of southeastern France, young Solomon Legare and his widowed mother arrived in Charles Town in 1686 after many months of exile: in Geneva, Switzerland, then in Bristol, England, where Solomon took an English girl for a wife. The Legares had been people of means in France and the gold which they secreted out served as capital for the family to establish comfortable new lives. By the 1690s, Solomon Legare was a great merchant and goldsmith in Charles Town. He outlived three wives -- the last the widow of Thomas Jones -- and sired nine children. Eagerly adopting the customs of the country, he forbade the use of French in the household. By 1711 he owned several pieces of land outside Charles Town; at Mullet Hall on John's Island he and his numerous descendants established a durable family dynasty.

The Legares' arrival, while the result of acute hardship, was eased by the wealth with which they began life in the new world. John Raven, a Baptist from London, came in rather different circumstances. A servant of Hugh Carteret when he stepped ashore at Charles Town in 1672, Raven worked his way through servitude, acquired "headright" land (350 acres) south of the Waights on John's Island, and by industry alone climbed to a position of wealth and influence. An important lay-leader of his denomination, thrice-elected member of the provincial legislature, at his death in 1717 he left property in Charles Town and working plantations of more than 1000 acres and 100 slaves on John's Island. While his sons failed to produce male heirs, through his daughters his blood and property descended through island families which included Mathewses and Vanderhorsts, who came to Carolina before 1700 but were associated with St. John's Colleton after 1720.

Receptacles of religious refugees in the 1600s, the islands of St. John's, Colleton drew the attention of people who were primarily drawn by economic possibilities in the 1700s. On the whole, land grants and individual purchases tended to be large, matching the ambitions of the men who most successfully sought them. This fact had two long-term consequences. Immigration by free, white, would-be settlers and entrepreneurs was limited to a few hundred people. Moreover, the demand for cheap labor was vast.

Kiawah, Edisto, and Bohicket tribesmen initially provided occasional labor for English wages: fishing, hunting, scouting, felling timber, planting and harvesting corn, piloting boats, and chasing runaway

servants, even contracting with John Seabrook to build his Edisto house for "12 Hatchets." Exploiting an existing pattern of forced servitude for prisoners of war among the Indians, the colonists also purchased Indian people as permanent servants, eventually adding to the number by enslaving hostiles taken by themselves in war. Free or unfree, Indian labor had disadvantages, including the natives' low life expectancy, and by 1710 islanders who sought added labor in their enterprises had turned decisively to different sources. The opportunity offered by the Lords Proprietors under the "headright" system for them to at once increase land holdings and enhance labor supply through the importation of European indentured servants and African slaves proved irresistible. When British Indian agent Thomas Nairne, writing in 1710, defined "planters" -- the occupational classification which became synonymous with white agriculturalists in Low Country South Carolina -- as those who follow "Tillage or Grasing" and "live by their own and their Servants' Industry," he spoke truly.

For white indentured servants, free passage and freedom after a relatively short period of years opened the possibility of pursuing their own dreams and interests. A number of successful planters besides John Raven, among them William Brockhurst (1678) and William Chaplin (1692), arrived in Charles Town unfree men. Of course, enslaved Africans who took their places in the work force after 1700 had no such prospects, and the fact that they constituted a "permanent solution" to the labor problem was one of the reasons the number of black slaves in the population soared. In 1700, the non-Indian population of St. John's Parish did not exceed three hundred, and about one in three residents was an African. Before the census count of 1789, the population -- now essentially non-Indian, as the native tribes were decimated by disease and war -- reached 5000 and the proportion of blacks to whites in the parish was eight to one.

"The tools that men who goe there ought to take with them are these, vis - An Ax, a Bill and Broad Hoe, an grubbing Hoe for every man, and a Cross cut Saw to every four Men, a whip Saw and a set of wedges and . . . some reaping hooks and Sythes, as like-wise Nails of all sorts. Hooks, Hinges, Bolts, and Locks for their houses."

Such was the advice the Lords Proprietors of Carolina offered their colonists of 1682. If one looks forward thirty years, the advice of Thomas Nairne to prospective settlers suggests that the work of settlement had changed little. It was bring axes and servants to use them. To be sure, Charles Town was by 1720 enjoying a rapid growth in population -- to 3,000 souls-- and profits in business -- exports each year worth 100,000 English pounds. However, as close as twenty miles to the southwest in the two hundred-odd square miles embraced by St. John's Colleton, wilderness conditions prevailed. When John Fenwick first settled on John's Island in 1721 his family lived in a house of notched logs and had Indians for neighbors. Thirty years later, the Fenwicks had settled into a Georgian mansion surrounded by white and black servants, blooded horses, and cleared fields, and the natives were gone. Between 1721 and 1750 across this parish islands, foundations of a plantation society were laid.

Trade was for Fenwick, like many another, the avenue to a planting life. A merchant of County Cumberland in England, he lived in Barbados and prospered in business in Charles Town in the Indian trade and the first flush days of the rice era before he acquired by purchase and an advantageous marriage to John's Island heiress Elizabeth Gibbes scores of servants and far-flung landed estates on John's Island and southward. Strong and imperious, he commanded militiamen in defense of Charleston in an assault by the French and Spanish in 1706. Afterward he sought and gained admission by election and appointment to a succession of public offices including the speakership of the Commons House of Assembly in 1727. Like the English gentry he emulated in his house and his career, he took his social position seriously: it is said that beneath a great oak tree on his estate ("John's Tree") was buried a young groom whom the planter apprehended in the act of eloping with his daughter and ordered summarily hanged.

The keys to success in St. John's were ever the same, good land and the means to exploit it, and both were readily available and reasonably priced: according to the common reckoning, an energetic planter could recoup his investment in three or four years. In the circumstances it is not surprising that men like the Quakers who came with artisan skills -- Waights, Stanyarnes, Beamors -- at most practiced

them in concert with commercial agriculture. It is also no wonder that some immigrants used the advantages of capital and acumen and connections to acquire estates far beyond the norm. On Edisto Island in 1732, thirty one percent of all slaves belonged to numerous members of one family, the Seabrooks, while twenty percent of property-owners owned less than six slaves each. Though the latter may have had "the necessarys of life" (to use the expression of Governor James Glen in 1751) they could not have found planting highly remunerative, and "poor laws" passed during the economic troubles that came with the imperial struggle called King George's War in the 1740s suggest that some planters at least occasionally fell below a bare subsistence. However, as long as land and labor were available, he parish was a fertile field for the talented and ambitious.

There was Anthony Mathews, an Englishman of unknown origins, who arrived in Carolina about 1700. By 1720 he had built a successful mercantile and shipping business in Charles Town and followed that with purchases of land on John's Island, perhaps 2000 acres in all, with enough slaves to defeat the swamps and build White Hall, a great plantation and mansion on the lower Bohicket Ridge, an elevation cutting across the island's swampy center. John Mathews, a grandson, was a member of the revolutionary Continental Congress in 1778 and chief executive of the new state of South Carolina at the end of the War for Independence in 1783.

Aaron Hanscome resided for some time in Massachusetts before he stepped off a ship in Charles Town in 1732 an impecunious and unattached young man and conscientious Presbyterian. Just three years later, he was able to purchase 105 acres from a John's Island tract along Abbapoola Creek once owned by Henry Woodward. At his death in 1761, his material legacy was still modest but on the rise, including 16 black slaves and 29 head of cattle, with a value of 2,669 pounds, which was divided between two surviving sons. With his own share and subsequent purchases from Hext heirs and others, one of the sons, Thomas, put together a fine estate of 1000 acres called Creekside. When he died in 1787 Thomas's legacy included a hundred slaves, a medical degree for his son, and a big house on Charles Town's Meeting Street.

Others came -- and went. Men -- and perhaps families -- with names like Inmer and Farr and Norton. The last-named was a turner and joiner; the scant record of him shows only that he had a black servant named Emmanuel who was also a turner and joiner and that they lived for a while on John's Island along the Stono north and east of St. John's parish church. Both master and servant failed to leave a lasting imprint in the parish, which by the 1740s was using art and industry to parlay the blessings of warm sun and fruitful soil into a general economic boom.

After the passage of a war-related recession in the 1740s, seasons of prosperity were so regular for several decades as to seem endemic. In 1749, Robert Seabrook announced that his granddaughter Susannah, only thirteen, would carry to her marriage with Abraham Bosomworth, Esquire, a recent appointment as imperial agent for Indian affairs, an endowment of "fifteen thousand pounds." (It was just the first of a string of society-climbing marriages by Seabrook women.) A few years later, John Stanyarne left to his heirs and favorite charities plantations on John's, Kiawah, and St. Helena Island further south totaling 6,400 acres and personal property including 289 slaves, with a reported value of 20,474 pounds sterling, perhaps $2.5 million. If the means to such affluence was slave labor -- and it should be noted that the market value of Stanyarne's slaves constituted about two-thirds of the estate -- the key commodities were live-stock, indigo, and "Carolina gold" -- rice.

Livestock arrived on the islands with the first planters. Thriving with little care on the abundant mast and native grasses, even through mild winters, cattle in particular quickly moved from a commodity for subsistence to a commercial product of some value, especially if slaughtered, packed, and shipped to the provisions-poor West Indies. As early as 1674, the Lords Proprietors, declaring that they "wanted planteres there and not graz-iers," forbade the entry of more cattle. But the numbers in the herds continued to grow: by 1710 herds of 200 head were common-place in St. John's Parish and more than 800,000 head, ten for every one human inhabitant, overflowed the cowpens and woods of the Low Country at 1750. When John Stanyarne purchased Kiawah Island, ten thousand acres of pristine real

estate, in 1727, its first use was as spill-over range for his burgeoning herds. But a superior money-maker was on the horizon, and by 1750 his private island was producing the blue dye indigo, by the 1760s 6000 pounds a year. Each fall great English ships tied up at Stanyarne's landing on the Kiawah River to load the prized commodity -- prices were so good, the saying went, that at Charles Town one could barter indigo and slave pound for pound.

Planters of Edisto Island came to rely heavily upon indigo as a cash crop, but only after 1750 and after a number of trials and some errors. Like most British colonists in the first decades of the eighteenth century, the planters of Edisto directed their most concentrated efforts to find a cash crop in rice. However, because of the salinity of much of the island's water, the quantity of land suitable to rice was limited and the yield and quality of rice disappointing. At least one resourceful fellow thought to turn the problem itself into an industry. Beginning about 1724 at Botany Bay and Townsend Creek on the Atlantic coast of Edisto Island, a Frenchman, William Mellichamp, set up evaporation basins and used the torrid summer sun to turn saline water into table salt. Under a franchise agreement with the government at Charles Town, he and his servants harvested and he sold 14,000 bushels of salt in local markets by 1731; thereafter, the record says no more about this intriguing experiment, although the Mellichamps remained in the Low Country, eventually settling just outside St. John's Parish on James Island. Through the 1700s, small and ephemeral saw mills exploited sections of Edisto's abundant maritime forest. Meanwhile, Edisto planters found and developed their best-yet-moneymaker in indigo.

A number of estates built on slaves and indigo were in place by 1750. Among the first and most durable were Old House, which was developed before 1735 by members of the Seabrook clan on land that had belonged to Paul Grimball and boasts the most venerable house now standing on the island. Another early indigo plantation was Brooklands, the creation of Welshman Joseph Jenkins, a relative of the Grimballs by marriage who emigrated about 1745.

Although rice was planted on John's Island by Henry Woodward at a very early date, as early as the 1780s, development of the art of rice cultivation consumed several decades, a process that probably owed less to any one or group of industrious English planters than to the African slaves who, unlike their masters, brought to the task prior familiarity with rice cultivation in West African homelands much closer to Carolina in climate and economy than northern Europe. The approved method called for intermittent watering of the delicate and thirsty plants and was initially achieved by accessing a good cypress swamp. In the later 1700s planters harnessed the power of tides to raise water to the fields; areas abutting rivers where tides were strong above the highest level of salt water, including areas of Edisto Island like Little Edisto and Jehossee watered by the South Edisto and its tributary Toogoodoo Creek, now showed a dramatic increase in value and productivity as rice land. However, rice production continued in other, less favored areas where planters made do with water from swamps or ponds. At the time of the American Revolution, a British mercenary of the kind commonly called Hessian found the landward side of Jones/Seabrook Island virtually encompassed in fresh-water ponds and associated rice fields covering many acres. Robert Gibbes's John's Island plantation Peaceful Retreat produced 102 barrels and 26 half-barrels of rice in 1789.

The "plantation" -- once referring to a colony of nationals projected into a foreign country but coming to mean a piece of land organized with unfree labor for commercial agriculture -- was,
as it would long remain, the absolute center of life, at once home, business office, civic center, and customs house. It may be said to have operated like an army camp. The planter, and for some purposes his wife, were comparable to officers, the servants soldiers in an enterprise in support of the master's family. The St. John's plantation was -- had to be -- largely self-sufficient. Beyond plantation fences were stretches of forest and swamp; larger planters could walk two miles in several directions and not leave their own estates. There was a tavern operated by Thomas Smith at the Haulover on lower John's Island in 1770, but no readily accessible retail stores or carpenters or schoolmasters for hire. Thus, foodstuffs like corn and potatoes were homegrown, and fowl, pigs, and cattle were kept for meat, eggs, and milk. Mistresses or servants, plantation women carried on a daily round of candle, soap, and textile making.

Other fundamental needs, from educating a planter's younger children -- one reason white servants were still in demand -- to fashioning boats, erecting buildings and fences, and doing a thousand other chores -- were usually met without outside help, most often by black slaves. (Notices placed by John's Island planters in the **South-Carolina Gazette** during the 1730s to 1750s listed slaves who were coopers, carpenters, tanners, wheelwrights, spinners, seamstresses, candlemakers, fishermen, and boatmen as well as fieldhands, cowboys, and domestics.) Only in a handful of the wealthiest households did children enjoy an idle youth.

A few public roadways were cleared and wooden bridges built by the 1760s, and paths, sometimes of brick laid by private efforts, linked some plantations. Yet land travel was difficult, sandy road beds grueling when dry and impassable when wet, and water carriage was preferred. That is why primary settlement of the islands was peripheral, why all the planters owned canoes and boats, some as large as schooners, and why a major determinant in the value of real estate was proximity to navigable water. A ferry spanning the Stono between John's Island and James Island on the most direct line to Charles Town was licensed by the Commons in 1733, the first of many. Provincial licensing statutes prescribed the use of "a sufficient number of slaves . . . night or day to carry passengers, horses, servants, slaves, cattle, sheep, calves, and hogs," and mandated free passage for folk going to church.

At the confluence of Bohicket Creek and Wadmalaw River, on John's Island, a parish church was begun about 1738 and completed in 1742. It was not the parish's first Christian place of worship by any means. There had been earlier Quaker meeting houses as well as Baptist and Presbyterian chapels. John's Island Presbyterian Church, begun at the initiative of a Scots clergyman, Archibald Stobo, had been housed nearby since 1719. Framed inside and out with hand-sawed and hand-carved lumber, put together with pegs, and roofed with black cypress shingles, the Presbyterian kirk was the image of a New England meeting house. An early highlight in its experience occurred in 1740, when the famed English George Whitefield showed up one Saturday morning to (as he described it) "read prayers and preach twice with much freedom" to "a great congregation." But the building of St. John's Parish Church, a modest enough brick structure in itself, was an event of greater importance, for as the Anglican church it became the center of civic life in this parish of islands, where political events and public business of many kinds were carried on. The building commission for this structure was filled with men of power, including four Stanyarnes, three Hexts, and a Waight, all [former] Quakers, as well as John Gibbes and John Fenwick.

The new church accommodated twenty-seven pews. By 1743, as was the custom, twenty-three pews had been sold to communing families, which included several residents of Wadmalaw, the remainder being kept for "Publique" use. The first rector, the Reverend Samuel Quincy, was new out of England. Elected by the vestry in 1744, he served until 1746. A succession of English- and Scottish-born clerics followed in regular cadence after the well-remembered Quincy, with just one or two breaks of the rhythm when the congregation had to rely on supply pastors. Diseases endemic to the Low Country -- become more virulent over the years as plantation agriculture focused human life next to river and swamp, the impoundment of water for use in rice cultivation and indigo processing adding to the environment wherein yellow fever- and malaria-bearing mosquitoes bred freely -- took the lives of Quincy's wife and five ministers of the first nine, including two who died within two years in 1774 and 1775. They remind us that the price paid for living in St. John's Parish could be high.

As the years passed, anxieties rose among the planters over threats from other sources. Settled close to Florida, they were made constantly aware by militia laws and musters of the menace of Spanish resentment. In 1739 something planters feared even more than the Spanish fort at St. Augustine burst across their horizon, a full-fledged slave rebellion. Tension had long been building across the Low Country. While the number and proportion of Africans in the population had in-creased immoderately, the bonds of servitude imposed by the planters in law and practice had drawn tighter and the labor demands heavier. A particularly disquieting sign of trouble was the large number of runaways, about two a week at the end of the 1730s. Well-advertised in the **South-Carolina Gazette,** reports of "slaves who

stole themselves" sometimes referred to white or Indian servants. However, the usual subject was one or more black slaves, and notices told more about conditions in slave quarters than was intended. One notice described a runaway who answered to the name July **found** on John's Island distinguished by the rags he wore. Another advertised a slave fugitive sought by William Edings of Edisto Island identifiable by "many whip marks on his back."

In late summer, 1739, on the eve of war between the British and Spanish empires, one Don Pedro, a Spaniard ostensibly on a diplomatic mission to Charles Town, made several landings along the lower Carolina coast, arousing suspicions that were subsequently expressed in the records of the Carolina legislature that his real mission was to procure a slave insurrection by promising English servants freedom in St. Augustine. Whatever the truth of such mistrust, during the early morning hours of Sunday, September 9, twenty conspirators led by an Angolan named Jemmy mounted an uprising in St. Paul's Parish on the western branch of the Stono River, a few miles from Wadmalaw Island. Plundering two country stores to get guns, they turned south, marching off toward Florida. Through the day, they encountered and killed a number of whites in farmsteads along their route, including the wife of a Colonel Hext, although a few they spared and others, including Lt. Governor William Bull, escaped their wrath and spread the alarm. By nightfall, half of the rebels, numbering at the end some sixty to one hundred men, were killed and captured by white militiamen aroused at Presbyterian Church services at Willtown Bluff. Still, thirty insurgents remaining at large produced a month of anxious days. The St. John's militia remained in a state of alert, and "settlement Indians were recruited as scouts and slave-chasers. Kept alive by continuing signs of slave restiveness like barn-burnings, the grim tension that seized the hearts of the planters had only begun to relax when a John's Island planter, William McClure, was murdered by his slaves.

McClure arrived on John's Island in the early 1730s. In 1731 and 1732, he was a party to three real estate transactions -- buying 430 acres in two lots on John's Island and selling 200 acres on the mainland along the Combahee River -- which probably suggests where his immediate past was spent. Be that as it may, he settled down on the Kiawah River at Chaplin's to plant and raise horses. He never married. In 1743, he deeded six slaves to John Seabrook for about 2000 pounds, a rather large sale considering that at his death in 1749 he kept only sixteen slaves to care for an estate which at that time included 22 horses, 24 cows, 20 pigs, and a farming operation which that year harvested 632 bushels of corn, 19 bushels of peas, 19 bushels of rice, 270 bushels of potatoes, and a quantity of indigo. However, if McClure worked his servants unreasonably, he was never charged with the offense under new legal sanctions against cruel and unreasonable use of slaves which were a legacy of the Stono Rebellion. The jury list for John's Island in 1744, based on property qualifications, included his name, as did a list, in 1745, of collectors of the charity tax. In short, he seems to have been a solid citizen. For all that, he was involved in a legal flap with planter Joseph Stanyarne
over a slave he allegedly acquired by fraud. In September, 1748, McClure had "a run-a-way Negro fellow" caught and returned unharmed.

In late 1749 and early 1750, William McClure's death was announced in the **South-Carolina Gazette** in two remarkably terse notices, as follows:

> [October 9, 1749] To be sold at public venue on Wed . on the plantation on John's Island whereon the late William McClure lived, formerly Chaplain's, all his personal estate, consisting of valuable slaves, some of the best Mares and Stallions in the Province, Hogs, Cattle, Household goods, corn, peas, potatoes, and indigo, a small Pettiaugua [boat], some leather, and sundry other articles, for 1 yr's credit, paying interest and giving such security as shall be required by
>
> Mary Vander Wick and William Spenser, Sr.
> Administrators

> [March 1, 1750] Four Negro men named Tony, Titus, Bob, and Cudjoe, were tried for killing William McClure and were found guilty by Anthony Matthews and William Boone.

The immediate consequences were addressed in equally brief minutes of the Commons House of Assembly dated April 25, 1750. In response to a petition of McClure's executors asking restitution to the estate for the loss of "4 negro slaves . . . executed for the murder of their master," it was decided that "the sum of 600 pounds be allowed for the same."

While a legend persists on John's Island that a number of eighteenth-century Stanyarnes were poisoned by their slaves, the murder of McClure, like the Stono Rebellion, was a singular event. The planters reacted variously. Perhaps jolted out of complacent assumptions about black people's happiness in, and suitability to, slavery, a few masters in years that followed set one or more slaves free, as did Suzannah Jones "in consideration of the long and faithful service of my Slave . . . Abraham" in 1755. Others distanced themselves from their plantations, spending more time in Charles Town or other commodious places, hiring overseers to manage their plantations and workers. This trend was reflected in advertisements in the **Gazette:**

> Overseer for a small plantation on Johns Island, must have good recommendations, none other need apply. If he has a wife that understands the Management of a Dairy, it will be no objection.

> WANTED, an Overseer for a Plantation on John's Island, an industrious Man, who is a very good Indigo Maker; if single, will be preferable.

Slave discipline was tightened a notch. A notice of 1770, purchased in the **Gazette** by the scion of one of the original John's Island Quakers, is chilling in its suggestion that the master would rather have the runaway returned dead than alive, so he would stand a proper example against recurrent misconduct.

> Run away, about a month ago, a negro fellow named May country born, very sensible, imagined to be about twenty-six years of age and well known on Johns Island. Ten pounds reward is offered to whoever will deliver him to Abraham Waight . also one hundred pounds is offered for his head . . .

Slave resistance waned. As the planters moved to throw official burdens and economic and political constraints imposed after a change of kings and ministers in England. In the 1760s, the majority of islanders [black slaves] were "in no position to take advantage of the libertarian rhetoric," though a handful would emerge from the American Revolution free men and women.

Until very near 1776, there was almost complete unanimity among the planters on the great questions that produced the War for Independence. They, or their forebears, had left the Old World in the first place to live according to designs of their own wills, and they had developed a touchy pride in mastery of their individual worlds. It was more than a little ironic, as Samuel Johnson averred, that men who made such a noise about liberty should own slaves. However, there were good reasons why slavery and liberty should flourish together. Not only was Black slavery the economic foundation of "white liberty." Exposure to the conditions of slavery made white men feel keenly the denial of rights of self-determination to themselves. Still, so strong was the identification with the Empire that there were among them many reluctant revolutionaries, and some, including a son of Edward Fenwick, who became armed

Loyalist partisans for the Empire when war came, and sailed away to England when "the unexpected but successful struggle for independence" ended. In 1789, the year George Washington was inaugurated first President of the United States, census takers found 600 white people, 4660 "slaves," and about forty free blacks and mulattos residing in 200 households in St. John's Parish. Fifteen percent of households had female heads, "planters" who were women. While ninety-five percent of households included slaves, James Maxwell, a young physician resident on Edisto Island, had only one; Robert Gibbes had 110. A few of the white households provided residences for free people of color as well as a number of slaves. Seventeen residents designated by the federal marshals as "free mulattos" lived separate lives on their own. A map drawn a few years later by a new resident of John's Island, Kinsey Burden, has the house and land of Free Straphon, undoubtedly a freedman, located one-half mile north of the Presbyterian Church, among neighbors including Ann Stanyarne and Micah Jenkins.

However much freedom from England nurtured their sense of mastery, the planters discovered independence had costs, and especially in the economic realm, the advantages of freedom being balanced by the impact of war and broken relations with England on plantations, buildings, equipment, and work force -- leading, by 1790, to the virtual abandonment of indigo in areas like Kiawah and Edisto where once it had been the chief source of wealth. Yet the planters of St. John's, including new residents like Kinsey Burden and William Aiken, men and families, with remarkable ease fastened upon a new agricultural staple, cotton, worked by the old standby--slave labor. In the first two decades of the nineteenth century, the size of the fortunes accumulated and the style of life enjoyed by the planters would far outstrip earlier standards. However, as an economic bellwether "sea island" cotton would prove fragile, susceptible to attacks of disease and insects and in its markets prone to glut. Due to intense demand, the price of slaves would climb to prohibitive heights while rumblings from the Northern "free" states announced the emergence of abolitionism. Little wonder that the planters of St. John's worried as they luxuriated in the period before the Civil War, their golden age.

ENDNOTES

1. The parish of St. John's Colleton, as defined in 1734, included "John's Island, Wadmalaw Island, Edisto Island, and other adjacent Islands to the seaward" later named Seabrook and Kiawah. See Sophia Seabrook Jenkins, **Commemorative History of St. John's Parish** (Charleston, S. C.: Walker, Evans, and Cogswell, 1970), pp. 1-2; Frederick Dalcho, **Historical Account of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South Carolina** (New York: Arno Press, 1972 [1820]), pp. 58-59, 89-90, 336, 360; Thomas D. Cooper and David J. McCord, eds., **The Statutes at Large of South Carolina**, 10 vols. (Columbia, S.C.: A. S. Johnston, 1836-41), III, pp. 135-140. The author wishes to acknowledge Elizabeth Hamilton Stringfellow, a native and resident of John's Island, without whose inspiration and research assistance this article could not
have been written.

2. Jack P. Greene, **The Quest for Power: The Lower Houses of Assembly in the Southern Royal Colonies, 1689-1776** (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1972 [1963]), pp. 31-39; Ruth M. Miller and Linda A. Lennon, **The Angel Oak Story** (Charleston: Tradd Street Press, 1989), p. 2.

3. M. Eugene Sirmans, **Colonial South Carolina** (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966), pp. 1-23; Aaron M. Shatzman, **Servants into Planters: The Origin of an American Image** (New York: Garland Publishing, 1989).

4. Richard Waterhouse, "Economic Growth and Changing Pat-terns of Wealth Distribution in Colonial Low Country South Carolina," **South Carolina Historical Magazine,** 89 (October 1988), pp. 207-212; Sirmans, **Colonial South Carolina,** p. 228; Carl Bridenbaugh, **Myths and Realities: Societies of the Colonial South** (New York: Atheneum, 1965), pp. 54-118; Stuart Owen Stumpf, "The Merchants of Colonial Charleston, 1680-1756," Doctoral Thesis, Michigan State University, 1971, p. 67.

5. Chalmers S. Murray, "Ruins of Edisto Plantation," **News and Courier** (Charleston, S. C.), May 19, 1957.

6. Edward Randolph to the Board of Trade, March 16, 1699, in A. S. Salley Jr., ed., **Narratives of Early Carolina** (New York: Scribner's, 1911), p. 205; Salley, ed., "Governor Joseph Morton and Some of His Descendants," **South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine,** 5 (April 1904), pp. 108-111; Clara C. Puckette, **Edisto** (Cleveland, Ohio: Seaforth Publications, 1978), pp. 1-5; Peter Wood, **Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina** (New York: W. W. Norton, 1974), pp. 27, 27n. Samuel Yankey was among the servants taken from Morton's plantation. He told his Spanish captors he was twenty years old, had been in servitude for twelve years, and had left England in 1682. John E. Worth, **The Struggle for the Georgia Coast** (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995), p. 153.

7. Robert G. Rhett, **Charleston: An Epic of Carolina** (Richmond, Va.: Garrett & Massie, 1940), pp. 12-13; Puckette, **Edisto**,p. 47; Nancy Rhyne, **Touring the Coastal South Carolina Backroads** (Winston Salem, N. C.: John F. Blair, 1992), pp. 196-197; Sirmans, **Colonial South Carolina,** pp. 40, 44; Beulah Glover, **Narratives of Colleton County** (Walterboro, S. C., no publisher, no date), pp. 2-9.

8. June 9, 1675: Langdon Cheves, editor, **The Shaftesbury Papers and Other Papers Relating to Carolina . . . prior to the 1676,** in South Carolina Historical Society **Collections** (Charleston, 1897), V, pp. 464-5.

9. Auditors General, **Memorials,** v. 3, p. 321; v. 5, pp. 35, 171-173, 267-268; v. 35, pp. 163-168, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia [SCDAH]; **Statutes,** II, pp. 116-117; **Wills, Inventories, and Miscellaneous Records**, v. 15, pp. 369-388, v. 53, pp. 156, 206-210, Charleston County Public Library [CCPL]; A. S. Salley, Jr., "Hugh Hext and Some of His Descendants," **South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine,** 6 (January 1905), pp. 29-39; James Haw, **John and Edward Rutledge of South Carolina** (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1997), pp. 3-4, 7, 19, 178, 229-230, 234; William J. Medlin, **Quaker Families of South Carolina and Georgia** (Philadelphia: Ben Franklin Press, 1982), p. 37; Mabel L. Webber, "Records of the Quakers in Charles Town," **South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine,** 28 (January 1927), p. 193; Jo Ann McCormick, "The Quakers of Colonial South Carolina," Doctoral Dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1984.

10. A. S. Salley, Jr., ed, **Warrants for Land in South Carolina, 1672-1711,** 3 volumes (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives, 1910-1915), I, pp. 29-30, 260, 333, 447-448, 460, 484, 487, 494, 508, 524, 536, 547, 554-555, 590, 605, 606, 617, 693; **Wills and Miscellaneous Records**, 1714-1717, pp. 182, 185-186, 345, 356; 1786-1793, pp. 389-391 [CCPL]; **Statutes,** II, pp. 17, 94, 209, 241, 288; IV, p. 237; VII, pp. 475-476; **Memorials**, v. 4, p. 36 [SCDAH]; **Wills and Miscellaneous Records,** v. 64, pp. 39-52, 105-113, 165-177; v. 67-B. pp. 361-363; **Deeds and Releases**, Book A3, pp. 493-503; Book

O-8, pp. 171-173, Register of Mesne Conveyance Office, Charleston [RMC]; **South Carolina Gazette**, April 22, 1759; January 1, 1763; Walter B. Edgar and N. Louise Bailey, **Biographical Directory of the South Carolina House of Representatives, II: The Commons House of Assembly, 1692-1775** (Columbia: University **of South Carolina Press, 1977), pp. 271-276;** David Ramsay, **History** of South Carolina, 2 vols. (Spartanburg, S.C.: The Reprint Company, 1962 [1858]), v 2, p. 3; Stanley South and Michael Hartley, **Deep Water and High Ground,** Research Manuscript Series 116, South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1980), Figure 1; Langdon Cheves, "Blake of South Carolina," **South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine**, 1 (April, 1900), pp. 153-161; Peter A. Coclanis, **The Shadow of a Dream** (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp. 48-82; Salley, "Morton", pp. 108-109.

11. Eliza C. Fludd, **Biographical Sketches of the Huguenot Legare** (No place, no publisher, no date), pp. 19-78.

12. **Warrants,** I, pp. 295, 362, 525, 568, 605, 616, 617, 621, 637; Raven Family Papers, File Folder # 30-4, South Carolina Historical Society. Charleston; McCrady Plats, Book X, p. 918; Book H, p. 190 [RMC]; "Mathews Family Genealogy" (unpublished paper by Evelyn M. Thom, Baton Rouge, La., 1974).

13. A. S. Salley, ed., **Journal of the Commons House of Assembly,** 21 volumes (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1907-1946), VI, pp. 21-22.

14. Quoted, Coclanis, **Shadow of a Dream**, p. 51; Wood, **Black Majority**, pp. 37-38; Theodore Rosengarten, **Tombee: Portrait of a Cotton Planter** (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1986), pp. 42-46.

15. **Warrants**, I, p. 295; Agnes Leland Baldwin, **First Settlers of South Carolina** (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970), pp. 35, 49, 240, 252; Wood, **Black Majority**, pp. 20-27, 43-47; Russell R. Menard, "Slave Demography in the Low Country, 1670-1740," **South Carolina Historical Magazine,** 96 (October 1995), pp. 282-303; Edmund S. Morgan, **American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia** (New York: W. W. Norton, 1975).

16. See Appendix. **Wills, Inventories, and Miscellaneous Records,** v. 61-A, pp. 102-103, v. 61-B, pp. 479, 561 [CCPL]; W. Robert Higgins, "Charleston Merchants and Factors Dealing in the Slave Trade," **South Carolina Historical Magazine**, 65 (October 1964), pp. 209-217; Wesley Frank Craven, **Southern Colonies in 17th Century** (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1949), pp. 152, 214, 323, 390, 400-l; Sirmans, **Colonial South Carolina,** pp. 14, 37, 89-99, 250-251, 352-353.

17. **The Shaftesbury Papers,** V, p. 4.

18. Nairne's advice (Quoted Wood, **Black Majority**, pp. 106-107):

> If any one designs to make a Plantation, in this Province, . . . the first thing to be done is, after having cut down a few Trees, to split Palissades, or Clapboards, and therewith make small Houses or Huts, to shelter the Slaves. After that, whilst some Servants are clearing the Land, others are to be employed in squaring or sawing Wall-plats, Posts, Rafters, Boards, and Shingles for a small house for the Family, which usually serves for a Kitchen afterwards, when they are in better Circumstances to build a larger [one]. During the Time of this Preparation, the Master Overseer, or white Servants, go every evening to the next Neighbor's House, where they are lodg'd, and entertain'd kindly, without any

Charges. And if the person have any wifeor Children, they are commonly left in some Friend's House, till a suitable dwelling Place and conveniences are provided, fit for them to live decently.

See Robert L. Meriwether, **The Expansion of South Carolina, 1729-1765** (Kingsport, Tennessee: Southern Publishers, 1940).

19. For a good brief treatment see Peter A. Coclanis,"The Hydra Head of Merchant Capital: Markets and Merchants in Early South Carolina," in David R. Chesnutt and Clyde Wilson, eds., **The Meaning of South Carolina History** (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), pp. 1-18. See also **Journals of the Commissioners of the Indian Trade, September 20, 1710-August 29, 1718** (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992 [1955], pp. 268-269.

20. Kenneth R. Jones, "A 'Full and Particular Account' of the Assault on Charleston in 1706," **South Carolina Historical Magazine,** 83 (January 1982), pp. 9-10; Lothrop Withington, "South Carolina Gleanings from England," **South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine**, 7 (January 1906), pp. 27-28; W. Stitt Robinson, **James Glen** (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1996), pp. 31, 40; Greene, **Quest for Power**, pp. 32-33, 268, 460, 478; Sirmans, **Colonial South Carolina**, pp. 104-105, 162, 188, 238; Kinloch Bull, Jr., **Oligarchs in Colonial and Revolutionary Charleston: Lieutenant Governor William Bull II** (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), pp. 37-38, 242; Rhyne, **Coastal South Carolina Backroads, pp.** 193-214. For a variant on the tale of "the Hanging Tree," see Jim Hayes, **James and Related Sea Islands** (Charleston: Walker, Evans, and Cogswell, 1978), pp. 137-140. Eventually, Maybank Highway was built through the old Fenwick Estate but the old tree, though growing in the middle of the thoroughfare, was spared until axed by the State Highway Department in the 1930s.

21. Robert Weir, **Colonial South Carolina** (Millwood, N.Y.:KTO Press, 1983), pp. 213-218; Greene, **Quest for Power**, pp. 32-33; Jenkins, **St. John's**, pp. 6-7.

22. Edgar and Bailey, **South Carolina House,** II, p. 435; Mathews Family Papers, Folder # 30-4, South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston. For the LaRoches, who came to Wadmalaw under very similar circumstances see Edgar and Bailey, **South Carolina House,** II, pp. 255-256; **Memorials,** II, pp. 123-124 [SCDAH].

23. A number of second generation planters were professional men. John Stanyarne had a law practice. **Wills, Inventories, and Miscellaneous Records,** v. 85-B, p. 900; v. 9, p. 108 [CCPL]; McCrady Plats # 4580 [RMC]; Edgar and Bailey, **South Carolina House,** II, p. 314; Weir, **Colonial South Carolina**, pp. 148-149, 205-227; **Journals of the Indian Trade**, pp. 45, 53.

24. Moll Map of 1711, Charleston Library Society; Hayes, **James**, pp. 11-12.

25. Bridenbaugh, **Myths and Realities**, pp. 66-67; George C. Rogers, Jr., **Charleston in the Age of the Pinckneys** (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969), p. 7; Lucile Jamison Farquhar, "Seabrooks of South Carolina" (Unpublished booklet in possession of Elizabeth H. Stringfellow), p. 7; **Wills, Inventories, and Miscellaneous Records,** v. 87A, pp. 239-241, v. 94B, pp. 436-443 [CCPL]; Edgar and Bailey, **South Carolina House**, II, pp. 654-655; John G. Leland, **History of Kiawah Island** (No place, publisher, date), p. 13; Debbie Hacker and Michael Trinkley, "Kiawah," in Trinkley, ed., **History and Archaeology of Kiawah Island** (Columbia, S. C.: Chicora Foundation, 1993), pp. 55-56; Coclanis, **Shadow of Dream**, p. 86.

26. See H. Roy Merrens, ed., **The Colonial South Carolina Scene, Contemporary Views, 1697-1774** (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1977), pp. 5-6, 64, 180-183; Hayes, **James**, p. 2; Coclanis, **Shadow of a Dream**: 58; Hacker and Trinkley, "Kiawah", pp. 53-55; Puckette, **Edisto**, p. 4; Leland, **Kiawah**, pp. 8-12; Rosengarten, **Tombee**, pp. 48-49.

27. Samuel G. Stoney, **Plantations of the Carolina Low Country** (Charleston: Carolina Art Association, 1977 [1938]), p. 28; **Wills, Inventories, and Miscellaneous Records,** v. 67, pp. 361-363 [CCPL]; Hayes, **James**, pp. 124-125; Nell Graydon, **Tales of Edisto** (Columbia: R. L. Bryan, 1955), pp. 22-23; Puckette, **Edisto**, p. 4; **South- Carolina Gazette**, June 30 1777.

28. While the reputation of indigo from other parts of the South Carolina Low Country was suspect in some markets of the world because of inadequate quality control in the processing, Edisto indigo, like the indigo of John Stanyarne, enjoyed a high repu-tation and dependable markets. **Warrants, 1672-1692**, p. 44; **South- Carolina Gazette**, December 24, 1753; South and Hartley, **Deep Water,** p. 94; Puckette, **Edisto**, pp. 4, 17; Leland, **Kiawah**, p. 12; John J. Winberry, "Reputation of Carolina Indigo," **South Carolina Historical Magazine,** 80 (1979), pp. 242-250.

29. Wood, **Black Majority:** chapter 2; Chalmers Murray, **This Our Land** (Charleston: Carolina Art Association, 1949), pp. 40-41; **Wills, Inventories, and Miscellaneous Records,** v. 67-B, pp. 361-363 [CCPL]; Plantation Report by Daniel Hall, March 2, 1789, Gibbes Papers, South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston, Miller and Lennon, **Angel Oak**, p. 3; George F. Jones, "The 1780 Siege of Charleston," **South Carolina Historical Magazine,** 88 (January 1987), p. 28.

30. Ted Rosengarten, "Passing the Test of Time: Kiawah's Most Venerable Landmark, the Vanderhorst Mansion, **Legends,** 7 (1996), p. 66.

31. **South-Carolina Gazette,** June 18, 1753; "Second Journal of Thomas Bosomworth, January, 1753," in William L. McDowell, Jr., ed., **Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, May 21, 1750 - August 7, 1754** (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992 [1958]), p. 326; Bryan, **Colleton, pp.** 85-92; Coclanis, **Shadow of a Dream,** pp. 146-147; Linda France Stine, **Revealing Historical Landscapes in Charleston County** (Columbia: South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and History, no date), p. 74.

32. **Statutes,** IX, pp. 10, 24, 79, 80, 84, 150, 193, 271-273, 335, 459; IV, p. 150; **Wills, Inventories, and Miscellaneous Records,** v. 73, pp. 187-193 [CCPL]; "Bosomworth", p. 326; "List of People in the Negro Trade," **South Carolina Historical Magazine,** 65 (1964), p. 210; Glover, **Colleton**, p. 91; Murray, **This Our Land,** p. 96; Jones, "Siege", p. 27; **Statutes,** IV, p. 150; Rosengarten, **Tombee,** pp. 88-89; Merrens, **Colonial South Carolina**, p. 179; Harvey S. Teal and Robert J. Stets, **South Carolina Postal History and Illustrated Catalog of Postmarks** (Lake Oswego, Ore.: Raven Press, 1989), p. 8.

33. Parish Minutes, in Jenkins, **St. John's**, p. 3; Hayes, **James,** p. 127.

34. Parish Minutes, in Jenkins, **St. John's,** 3, 4, 9. Pre-mature death from disease also stalked the natives-born. The following is an entry in an old Bible from St. John's Colleton:

> John Beamor
> His Book
>
> Was married August, 5th day 1701 to Miss Florance Morton.

My daughter Florance was born September 13th, 1702 . . .
My son Joseph was born 12th:: March 1703/4 . . .
My son Joseph departed this life July 28th:: 1704.
My wife departed this Life August 28th:: 1707.
My second wife and I was married 7th:: December 1710. . . .
My Brother Jacob Beamor departed this Life 16th January 1712.
My wife departed this Life 24th:: Sept. 1716.
Was married to Mrs. Judith Steward [Stuart] . . .

Salley, "Morton", p. 114.

35. **South-Carolina Gazette,** May 17, 1736; March 9, 1738; April 12, 1739; September 30, 1740; February 5 1753. See Daniel C. Littlefield, **Rice and Slaves: Ethnicity and the Slave Trade in Colonial South Carolina** (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), p. 162; Ira Berlin, "Time, Space, and the Evolution of Afro-American Society on British Mainland North America," in Philip D. Morgan, ed., **Diversity and Unity in Early North America** (New York: Routledge Inc.: 1993), pp. 126.

36. J.H. Easterby and Ruth Green, eds., **The Colonial Records of South Carolina. The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, 1739-41** (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1953), p. 69, 81; John K. Thornton, "African Dimensions of the Stono Rebellion," **American Historical Review,** 96 (1991), p. 1109; Jane Landers, "Garcia Real de Santa Teresa de Mose, A Free Black Town in Spanish Florida," **American Historical Review,** 95 (1990), pp. 9-30; Darcie MacMahon and Kathleen Deagan, "Legacy of Fort Mose," **Archaeology,** 49 (September/October 1996), pp. 54-58; Kenneth W. Porter, "Negroes on the Southern Frontier," **Journal of Negro History**, 35 (January 1948), p. 59; **Statutes,** III, pp. 556-572, 681; John Donald Duncan, "Servitude and Slavery in Colonial South Carolina," diss., Emory University, 1972, pp. 777-784; Wood, **Black Majority**, pp. 323-326.

37. **Wills, Inventories, and Miscellaneous Records**, v. 77-B, pp. 381-382; v. 69-B, p. 528 [CCPL]; **Memorials,** III, pp. 454-455 [SCDAH]; Jenkins, **St. John's**, p. 7; Mary B. Warren, **South Carolina Jury Lists, 1718-1783** (Danielsville, Georgia: Heritage Papers, 1977); **Statutes,** III, pp. 293, 422; **South-Carolina Gazette,** September 9, 1748.

38. **South-Carolina Gazette,** October 9, 1749; March 1, 1750.

39. R. Nicholas Olsberg, ed., **The Colonial Records of South Carolina: The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, 23 April 1750-31 August 1751** (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1974), p. 35.

40. **Wills, Inventories, and Miscellaneous Records,** v. 83A, p. 284 [CCPL]; Wood, **Black Majority,** p. 324; Philip D. Morgan, "Black Society in the Low Country, 1760-1810," in **Slavery and Freedom in the Age of the American Revolution,** Ira Berlin and Ronald Hoffman, eds. (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1983), pp. 115-120.

41. **South-Carolina Gazette**, September 27, 1770, June 30, 1777.

42. **South-Carolina Gazette**, August 30, 1770.

43. Wood, **Black Majority,** p. 326.

44. Jack P. Greene, "'Slavery or Independence': Reflections on the Relationship Among Liberty, Black Bondage, and Equality in Revolutionary South Carolina," **South Carolina Historical Magazine,** 80 (July 1979), pp. 193-214; Edmund S. Morgan, "Slavery and Freedom: The American Paradox," **Journal of American History**, 59 (June 1972), pp. 5-29; Kenneth Greenberg, **Masters and Statesmen** (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Press, 1985), pp. 85-90; Ramsay, **South Carolina, II,** pp. 235-250.

45. **Heads of Families at the First Census of the United States, 1790** (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1972): see appendix; Burden Map, copy in possession of Elizabeth H. String-fellow, John's Island.

46. Graydon, **Edisto**, p. 36; Hacker and Trinkley, "Kiawah," pp. 61-71; I. Jenkins Mikell, **Rumbling of the Chariot Wheels** (Columbia, S. C: The State Company, 1923); William Freehling, **Prelude to Civil War** (New York: Harper & Row, 1965).

"Loyal Women of Palmetto": Black Women's Clubs in Charleston, South Carolina

Black women in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century America were relegated to a subordinate position in society. Although women in general lived in a society that treated them as second class citizens, black women had a double handicap as females and blacks in a white, male-dominated society. They had no place in "the Republic of free and independent womanhood of America."[1] As the mothers of a distinctive race in America, they have been relatively unknown in historiography. From the time of slavery, however, black women have demonstrated an incredible will that allowed them to survive and become a formidable force in their homes and communities. They have played a significant role in the social, cultural, educational, religious, and economic institutions designed to improve the material conditions and raise the self-esteem of black people in America.[2]

The development of the black women's club movement in Charleston was a product of the harsh economic, political, and social conditions of black people in post-Civil War South Carolina. By the end of the Reconstruction era, discrimination and enforced institutional separation of the races in Charleston had taken a firm hold. Promising gains made during Reconstruction came into question as race relations deteriorated. In South Carolina, as in the southern states generally, disfranchisement measures were largely in places by the end of the century.[3] In Charleston, the mentally insane of both races were strictly segregated at Roper Hospital. Even in death South Carolinians were segregated; race determined whether a person would be interred in the black or white city cemetery. Most of the black leaders of the Reconstruction era were either getting out of politics, leaving the state, or dying.[4] Slowly but surely blacks were eliminated from the Charleston City Council. From 1890 to 1906 a series of new laws were enacted providing for segregation on railroads, streetcars, ferries, restaurants, and steamboats. Even the city's new electrified trolley prohibited use by black citizens. Although Charleston had been integrated in terms of its housing patterns, this too began to change at the turn of the century.

The rise of Jim Crow laws, an increase in lynching and other types of mob violence warranted a response from the black community.[5] There were seventy-three lynchings of blacks in South Carolina between 1882 and 1900, although fortunately there were none in Charleston. The local newspaper, The News and Courier, opposed lynching. Nevertheless, this period in Charleston's history was a nadir for most blacks in the city. Although blacks would be eventually disfranchised by the Tillmanite Constitution of 1895, in the late 1880s many still held office. For example, George Washington Murray was Inspector of Customs in 1889, and Benjamin Boseman was postmaster. Murray, a native of Sumter County and a teacher who attended the University of South Carolina from 1874-1876, was the last black to represent South Carolina in Congress in the 1890s.[6] Although politically blacks would remain with the Republican party in South Carolina until 1932, the white Democratic primary was the real election. Blacks not disfranchised by various literacy tests and poll taxes were often too intimidated to vote. Those who did try to remain active politically often met violent ends. When a black was chosen Postmaster in Lake City in 1898, whites set his house on fire and shot his family when they tried to escape. Only a few black Republicans voted into the twentieth century.[7]

Exclusion from the white mainstream meant that the black community in Charleston had to survive independently. Indeed, blacks started their own newspapers and schools; some joined trade unions and became stevedores. Others worked in knitting mills, cotton mills, shoe factories, and phosphate mines. The number of black lawyers and black doctors multiplied as the community began to turn inward in order to meet its own needs.[8] Many black men and women became teachers in the

segregated schools of the state. The formation of black women's organizations in Charleston was evidence of the black community's credo of self-reliance in the face of adversity.

In the white world, black women's morality was seen as the primary reason for the black race's lowly condition. Negative stereotypes about black women abounded in popular literature and scientific writings. It was asserted that black women had the "brain of a child and the passions of a woman, steeped in centuries of ignorance and savagery and wrapped about with immemorial vices."[9] As these views were being articulated about black women, it was also assumed that they were without romance and incapable of femininity or any of the votaries that glorified relationships between men and women. Such verbal attacks and the general deterioration of race relations throughout the nation only exacerbated the problem. Middle class black women began to respond to such atrocities, and the elevation of the race became the focus of their activism. The benefit of a better socioeconomic and educational background did not shield these women from the effects of racism nor did it guarantee equal participation of their people in American society. The leadership of such women became the force of self-reliance that uplifted the black community and black womanhood from within. It was from such necessity that black women's clubs emerged in America.[10]

Black women's reform efforts began in the antebellum period with the founding and support of educational institutions. However, such efforts assumed a more cohesive from 1896 with the formation of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs (NACWC). Although Jim Crow measures contributed heavily to the formation of the NACWC, it was a verbal insult that further facilitated the development of black women's leadership nationally. In 1895, James Jacks, president of the Missouri Press Association, wrote to Florence Belgarmie, secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society in England that, "the Negroes in this country were wholly devoid of morality, the women were prostitutes and all were natural thieves and liars."[11] The consolidation of two organizations, the National Federation of Afro-American women and the National League of Colored Women, into a national organization represented middle class black females' efforts to fight such libelous remarks and the growing racism of the late nineteenth century. Black club women sought to prove that with equal opportunities and equal education they were not unlike other women in the country. The absence of social welfare institutions in Southern communities and the exclusion of blacks from those that existed led black women to found orphanages, old folks' homes and other such institutions. A pioneer in the black women's club movement, Fannie Barrier Williams, asserted that, "women's interests, children's interests, and men's interests that are so finely worked out in the social development of the more favored races are but recent recognitions in the progressive life of the negro race."[12]

White women's organizations such as the General Federation of Women's clubs were formed as early as 1890 for the betterment of womankind. The philosophy of this organization was essentially the same as black women's clubs, as its women were equally concerned with social and economic problems at the local and national level. With its biennial meetings the General Federation of Women's Clubs became a showcase for the accomplishments of women's clubs. According to Mrs. J.C. Croly, historian and honorary vice-president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, "The club, from the beginning, accomplished two purposes. It provided a means for the acquisition of knowledge, the training of power; and the working of a spirit of human solidarity, a comprehension of the continuity of life, its universal character and interdependence."[13] However, in showcasing their strengths they also revealed their weaknesses. Southern delegates of the organization were opposed to including representatives from black women's clubs or individual women such as Josephine St. Pierre Ruffin, Fannie Barrier Williams, or Mary Church Terrell. These women had been previously admitted to all white clubs in the North.[14]

The organization of separate black women's clubs represented a step forward for the moral uplift of the black race. Although they shared many of the ideas and activities of white women's clubs, their goals were sometimes vastly different. Like white women's clubs, black women's clubs were largely

founded by middle class women. Members of these clubs on a national level, however, tended to include working women, tenant farm wives, and poor women as well. Black women's clubs imbued the black community with the powers of self-help by stressing education, self-improvement and community improvement. There was also a very strong emphasis on race pride, reform in the black community, the home, and race advancement.[15] Although studies of black women's clubs have been focused at a national level, local studies exemplify the national club movement on a smaller and personalized scale. Charleston, South Carolina, was one place in which such activism began to emerge in the early years of the twentieth century with the formation of black women's clubs. Such clubs were formed under the premise of aiding the black community and teaching young black women the skills of domestic training and womanhood such as crocheting, sewing, and cooking.[16] The first federated umbrella organization for the state of South Carolina was the South Carolina Federation of Colored Women's Clubs which was formed May 1909 at Sidney Park C.M.E. Church in Columbia. Mrs. Celia D. Saxton was the organization's first president. In Charleston, the Charleston City Federation of Colored Women's Clubs was founded May 16, 1916 at Centenary Methodist Episcopal Church by Mrs. Ida Green, the wife of Reverend Nathaniel Green, Centenary's pastor. The Charleston City Federation was comprised of thirteen clubs and approximately 175 members.[17] Later, many of the clubs under the City Federation would form junior clubs to teach the next generation of black women how to organize themselves and take their place in the community.

One stimulus to club involvement in Charleston came from Mrs. Mary Church Terrell, a pioneer in the black women's club movement, the organizer and first president of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs. When Mrs. Terrell spoke in Charleston at Mt. Zion A.M.E. Church in the 1920s, she discussed the role of the modern woman before a packed audience and stressed the role of women as daughters, sister, mothers, and wives. According to Mamie Garvin Fields, a club woman from Charleston and founder of the Modern Priscilla Federated Club, Terrell also put particular emphasis on the role of educated black women in the community: "Those of us fortunate enough to have education must share it with the less fortunate of our race. We must go into our communities and improve them; we must go out into the nation and change it. Above all we must organize ourselves as Negro women and work together." Mrs. Terrell had the women of Mt. Zion A.M.E. Church so stirred up that, "nobody wanted to wait till morning to pick up our burden again. Everywhere you might look, there was something to do."[18]

One example of black women's organization in Charleston was the Phyllis Wheatley Literary and Social Club. On December 5, 1916, Jeanette Keeble Cox founded the Phyllis Wheatley Literary and Social Club and became the group's historian. Mrs. Cox was a woman with a history of assertive efforts to uplift the black community and black womanhood. As the wife of Avery Normal Institute principal Benjamin Cox, Mrs. Cox assumed a motherly role at the school. She was remembered as an "extraordinary person" and "a lady."[19] Mrs. Cox would schedule regular conferences with the female students to discuss proper decorum and proper conduct, particularly concerning relationships with the opposite sex.

Initially, club membership was limited to educated women in the community. Consequently, about half of the charter members were teachers on the Avery staff. Society in black Charleston was separated into its own levels. As a Georgian, Mrs. Cox was very aware of the color and class divisions within Charleston's black community. Hence, members of the club were to be a "mixture of a perfect social compound" which would hopefully bridge many of the social gaps that existed. Those selected were said to be the "literary lights of Charleston."[20] The inclusion of Avery teachers and black public school teachers was necessary according to Mrs. Cox, for at that time all of Charleston's ills were laid to the lack of unity among its social groups. And it must also be remembered that that might leveler, Negro teachers in the city schools, was still the substance of things hoped for and some of us thought this might

be a splendid little way of beginning that united, homogenous Negro society which we might look forward to others completing long after we had passed from the stage of action.[21] It was Mrs. Cox's hope that with Avery teachers setting the example and the Phyllis Wheatley Club as its catalyst, black Charleston would eventually rise above its intraracial strife. Such contention had existed since the days of slavery, and even after emancipation, the Charleston black community continued to stratify itself by skin color and pre-Civil War status.

The objective of the club was "self-improvement along literary lines and community work." Initially called the Phyllis Wheatley Literary and Civic Club, its first officers were: President, Mrs. Jeanette K. Cox; Vice President, Mrs. Lulu DeMond; Secretary, Mrs. Mattie J. Miller; and Treasurer, Mrs. Susie D. Butler. The meetings were held bi-monthly at the members' homes alphabetically arranged. Monthly dues were ten cents.[22]

At the second meeting on December 14, 1916 a constitution was adopted that clearly outlined the purposed and goals of the club. "We a Company of Colored Women of the City of Charleston seeing the need of improving ourselves in Literary Work and also a great need of general community work among out people do so adopt the following constitution." The first article of the constitution named the club as the Wheatley Community Club, and the second adopted its motto, "To Lift Others as We Climb to Nobler Heights," an adaptation of the national organization's motto, "Lifting as We Climb."[23]

In the first few years of the club's existence the focus tended to be largely literary. The charter members reviewed books such as The Cloister and the Hearth by Charles read and studied the poems of Phyllis Wheatley and a biography of Mary Slesser of Callabar. They discussed the art of Edwin A. Harleston, a Charleston artist, as well as The Importance of Correct Parliamentary Usage by Rev. A.L. DeMond. The club invited black artists, musicians, and intellectuals to appear as guests as well as sponsoring them at citywide events. Members presented plays, delivered papers, and debated the issues of the time. For example, a paper was presented during the first year of the club about "the first Congresswoman, Miss Rankin' and another about Vivisection.[24] The club also discussed works written by contemporaries concerned with race relations of the time such as The Souls of Black Folk by Dr. W. E. B. DuBois who visited Charleston and the club in the early 1930s.[25]

Community reform efforts did not lag far behind the literary pursuits of the club. The club supported the Avery Institute's library and fund raising efforts as well as awarding as annual Phyllis Wheatley English Prize to a promising student at the school.[26] The members of the organizations were not blind to the atrocities that occurred in their own city such as the impoverished conditions of black children. In an entry in the minutes for January 9, 1917, Miss Naomi Spencer, a club woman who was engaged in social services in New York, "opened our eyes to the deplorable conditions of some of our boys and girls in the city."[27] After 1917, such reports encouraged the momentum for the club's activities in the community to pick up. Money was raised to help the local YWCA, and young people were recruited from the community to provide entertainment and to assist the club in its fundraising efforts. At a meeting on January 31, 1918, a Ways and Means committee was formed. There was a seven dollar credit for each of the clubs in the city and only thirteen dollars remained to be raised. It was decided that some of the women would sell tags (this is similar to a garage sale) to raise the money. The others made small donations of approximately fifty cents to support the effort.[28]

The club did not limit its community involvement to the YWCA. The Phyllis Wheatley was also affiliated with the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs. Jeannette Cox was chosen as its first delegate to the state convention.[29] On February 13, 1917, the club joined the Charleston City Federation of Colored Women's Clubs. The club would also undergo a name change to the Phyllis Wheatley Literary and Social club at the August 1917 meeting.[30]

Black women's clubs in Charleston gave assistance to many of the city's organizations. The Jenkins Orphanage, an orphanage for black children, received an annual donation of five dollars from

the Phyllis Wheatley beginning in 1922-23. In 1919-1920, fifteen dollars was raised to support the state federation's efforts to maintain the Fairwold School for Delinquent Girls in Cayce, South Carolina, later renamed the Marion Wilkinson Home for Girls.

The Marian Wilkinson Home for Girls was the creation of the South Carolina Federation of Colored Women's Clubs. During World War I, some young women ran after the young men who joined the Army. When the young men were sent overseas, these young women were left destitute and open for exploitation. Mamie Garvin Fields spoke of many uprooted young girls hanging around Fort Jackson in Columbia, South Carolina. Black clubwomen felt a responsibility to these girls because they were the daughters of the black community. Thus, the federation established a home for them. According to Thelma I. Washington, each federated club district in South Carolina would recommend a girl who needed a home, a place to stay, care and guidance. If they did not have anyone to care for them, this recommendation would allow them to be sent to the home. The home would care for the girl, and the club that recommended her would provide items for her upkeep and personal maintenance. For example, the Marian Anderson Circle of which Ms. Washington was a member, would be the direct sponsor.[31] According to Mamie Garvin Fields, her club, the Modern Priscilla, would furnish dresses for the home and the Jenkins Orphanage:

> What we did for ourselves we did for the girls. When we said that we would furnish so many dresses for the Wilkinson Home, the Jenkins Orphanage, or some other group, we wouldn't look around for rummage. We would put the money together for the goods. Or some member would donate so many yards of gingham, another so much batiste. We believed in sewing up-to-date dresses for our girls.[32]

The land for the Marian Birnie Wilkinson home was donated by the Episcopal Church, and the federation raised $30,000 to build the home just outside the state capital. The home was named after Marian Birnie Wilkinson who was instrumental in founding the effort. Her husband was president of South Carolina State College, and she herself was the third president of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs.[33]

Black club women also supported the Charleston branch of the NAACP which was formed on February 27, 1917. Of the NAACP's four original officers, Susie Dart Butler, a charter member of the Phyllis Wheatley Club, was treasurer. Jeannette Cox's husband, Benjamin F. Cox, was also on the executive committee.[34] In 1922, Mrs. Cox was appointed by a representative of the organizations to collect funds for the NAACP's "Million Dollar Anti-Lynching Campaign." Each member contributed one dollar to the cause.[35] They also aided another of the NAACP's causes with a donation of eight dollars in 1925 for the Sweet case of Detroit, Michigan. Ossian Sweet, a black physician, and his family moved into a white neighborhood in Detroit and were arrested for shooting to death a white man who was part of a mob surrounding their house.[36]

Black club women were important to interracial progress in the city. In 1922, the Phyllis Wheatley Club invited Mrs. Clelia P. McGowan, chairman of the South Carolina Interracial Committee, to address the group. The Interracial Committee, committed to fostering better race relations in the state, was founded in Charleston through the YWCA in the 1920s.[37] One of the issues that confronted the black and white members of the committee was the question of facilities for soldiers during World War II. Swimming facilities had been provided for white soldiers, white no facilities were provided for black soldiers who were not supposed to come into Charleston. After much deliberation among the black members of the Committee, a separate USO was provided for black soldiers.[38]

From the beginning of the Phyllis Wheatley Club's organization, its membership was limited. A roll of the charter members of the organization includes the names of many of Charleston's black elite. However, membership in the organization was not restricted because of skin color. Indeed, Jeanette Cox had never intended for membership in the club to be based on intraracial strife. Rather, she sought to alleviate it through the club. In securing membership for the club Mrs. Cox stated, there was never a subtle plan or motive that came to the surface...we thought it best the memberships should not follow any of the already prescribed social lines. The lines which bound the existing groups were to be altogether ignored and some members were to be chosen from this, that and the other social groups. The Phyllis Wheatley then was to be a sort of social crucible in which we might begin a mixture of a perfect social compound. Culture was to be the means to unite black leadership and to foster racial solidarity to create a truly "united, homogeneous Negro society."[39]

The Phyllis Wheatley Club perpetuated this belief through its study of black history and culture. In 1917, the women voted, "to discuss some of the lives of the great men of our race using as a guide native Charlestonian Benjamin Brawley's book, The Negro in Literature and Art.[40] In 1920, the club also saw a need for a greater variety of reading material and a list of books on Negro life or by Negro authors was brought in. Chapters from W.E.B. DuBois' Darkwater were reviewed by club members. One meeting in 1921 was entirely devoted, "to Africa's contribution to world civilization."[41] Between 1916 and 1934 guest speakers and performers included local artists and musicians such as Edmund Jenkins, who was a members of the Royal Academy of Music in Great Britain from 1914-1920, William Lawrence, and Edwin A. Harleston. National celebrities such as W.E. B. DuBois, Marian Anderson, and Langston Hughes were among the guest speakers and performers sponsored by the club.[42]

The Phyllis Wheatley Club's efforts and achievements in Charleston's black community were admirable. However, as a number of members were light-skinned and married to doctors and other professional men, this appeared to by symbolic of the divisions that existed in the black community. Mrs. Jeannette Cox had formed the club under the premise of creating an ideal social group, but she had underestimated the depth of such resentment along color and class lines. As a result, women such as Mamie Garvin Fields began to form other black women's clubs. Mrs. Fields was extremely critical of intraracial segregation in Charleston and felt that many of the black women's clubs excluded certain black women regardless of their ability, education, or readiness to serve. She also blamed this for the slow formation of the Charleston City Federation of Colored Women's Clubs,

> ...we in the South moved slowly. In Charleston it took us twenty more years (beyond the 1896 formation of the NAWC) to "confer together' as a City Federation. And then, even after we had the Federation, the Charleston attitudes held back progress. Joining the City didn't mean you could join a club. Many people in the community were not invited to join the individual clubs; regardless to your ability, your education, your readiness to serve, you were excluded, The City Federation couldn't progress until women started new clubs.[43]

The Modern Priscilla Club was formed by Mrs. Fields, Mrs. Lem Lewis, and Mrs. Viola Ford Turner, nurses at the McClennan Banks hospital who organized a group of twenty black women in June of 1925. In the formation of the club Mrs. Fields state, "We didn't look for women of any particular description, and we didn't just call together people we already knew. We wanted to find energetic women who wanted to do more than meet and socialize." Most of the women in the club were also teachers, but there was also a smattering of housewives, domestic workers, businesswomen, and beauticians. The club took its name from a Boston art magazine for ladies entitle *The Modern Priscilla* which published direction on

how to make things for the home and self. Needlework was the forte of the club, and Mrs. Fields recalled that, "We made many a pretty dress or dainty shirtwaist from the ideas that we found in the magazine."[44] The club was so well organized, so quickly that the state federation asked it to serve as a "model club" to show other clubs how to "elect and rotate all necessary officers, establish rules, keep the records, and so forth."[45] It also subscribed to the "Lifting as We Climb" philosophy of the national organization and performed many of the same acts of benevolence for young black women and the black community such as supporting the Jenkins Orphanage in Charleston and the Wilkinson Home in Cayce, South Carolina.[46] Incidentally, Mrs. Susie Dart Butler, and Mrs. Eloise Harleston Jenkins, members of the Phyllis Wheatley, were also members of the Modern Priscilla.

The Phyllis Wheatley Literary and Social Club sought cultural self-improvement in hopes of producing more useful and respectable citizens. They were not limited in their focus, however, by sponsoring cultural, fund-raising and other community events these women developed their organizational and leadership abilities as well as their self-confidence. In striving for the upliftment of black womanhood, the club upheld a Victorian attitude toward life while at the same time deciding that women should have careers outside of the home.

Ruby Pendergrass Cornwell and Cynthia McCottry Smith, two of the older members of the Phyllis Wheatley Literary and Social Club, give testimony to its contributions to the black community and black womanhood in Charleston. Ruby P. Cornwell, a native of Foreston in Clarendon County, South Carolina began her formal education at Miss Lucy Laney's School in Augusta, Georgia, later known as the Haine's Institute. Mrs. Cornwell attended the ninth grade at the Avery Normal Institute in Charleston and continued her education at the Daytona Normal and Training School (today Bethune-Cookman College) in Daytona, Florida. After earning her bachelor's degree in English at Talladega College, she came back to Charleston to teach at the Avery Institute in 1925.[47] She joined the Phyllis Wheatley Literary and Social Club in 1925 for fellowship and for intellectual stimulation. Mrs. Cornwell remembers reading and reviewing books and presenting Marian Anderson at Centenary Methodist Church before the singer became famous. Besides being active in Phyllis Wheatley for more than twenty year, Mrs. Cornwell was also a member of Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority in Charleston. Through AKA she was able to uplift the black community and young black women in particular as the creator of its annual debutante leadership program. The debutante program taught young black women social and professional skills and presented them to society.

Cynthia McCottry Smith was born on Percy Street in Charleston on December 27, 1922. Part of a family of Avery graduates and an Avery graduate herself, Mrs. Smith completed her undergraduate education at Bennett College in Greensboro, North Carolina, and earned her master's degree from New York University in 1956. She began teaching at the Avery Normal Institute in September of 1945 and subsequently taught in the public school system in Charleston County for thirty-three years. As for her participation in black women's clubs in Charleston, Mrs. Smith was a member of the Edifities, Alpha Kappa Club, and Three Fours Bridge Club. She has been a member of the Phyllis Wheatley club since 1948. According to Mrs. Smith, "black women's clubs in Charleston were a group of women coming together for a common purpose to help mankind in any shape or form."[48] She remembers the Jenkins Orphanage as one of the primary organizations to receive assistance from the Phyllis Wheatley. She also remembers the deplorable condition that the orphanage was in until recent years. The club also gave assistance to the McClennan Banks hospital and other community organizations that helped the less fortunate. Mrs. Smith remembers the Phyllis Wheatley Club encouraging women to become ladies and to be of service to the family and the community. The club was like a "mini finishing school" which attempted to reach as many young women as possible. Mrs. Smith stressed that black women's clubs were never purely social in nature. Their formation was firmly based on the idea of uplifting the black community in Charleston as well

as uplifting black womanhood through training and literary pursuits. Mrs. Smith continues to be an active member of the Phyllis Wheatley Literary and Social Club as well as a member of the Avery Institute and several bridge clubs.

The work of black club women in Charleston, South Carolina and throughout the United States was not unlike that of white women's clubs in that they tended to be led by middle class women. In the first three decades of the twentieth century, the work of black club women contributed to the survival of the black community both on the national and local level. Unlike white women's clubs, black women's clubs were a crucial part of negotiating and bridging class and color barriers. By concerning themselves with the needs and issues of poor women and working mothers, they sought to remove the stereotype of black women as an immoral embarrassment to their race. Black club women also emphasized education, self-improvement and community improvement but there was always a more important emphasis on race pride and race advancement.[49]

The Phyllis Wheatley Literary and Social Club and the Modern Priscilla were very much like their national predecessor in its goals and achievements. The advances of women's rights in the early twentieth century had not matured enough to fully embrace black women as a part of the movement. Although some black women were members of traditionally white organizations, that did not guarantee inclusion, respect, or success. The black women's club movement was the conduit that was responsive specifically to the needs of the black community. As Fannie Barrier Williams stated,

> Temperance, mothers' meetings, sewing schools, rescue agencies, night schools, home sanitation and lectures on all subjects of social interest were some of the many things attempted and carried on by black women's clubs. These clubs made themselves felt for good in their respective communities. In some places these groups of women constituted the only organized force among the colored people for any purpose, and they are recognized as such in every instance where the organized voice of colored people is needed.[50]

These were the clubs that made a way out of no way to ensure the progress of the black race.[51] Black women's clubs were successful in their efforts to uplift the black community and black womanhood in Charleston, South Carolina. The title of this study, "Loyal Women of Palmetto," is evidence of such efforts. Taken from the chorus of the federation anthem of black women's clubs in South Carolina and set to the tune of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic," its verses symbolize the dedication of black women in the state to the upliftment of black womanhood, the maintenance of the sanctity of the home, the expansion of educational opportunities, the establishment of prohibition, and the provision of social services to the needy. The passage of the civil rights acts in the 1960s, the activism of black sororities and changing attitudes have made more opportunities available for African Americans locally and nationally. Because of this, there has been less need for black women's clubs to be a motivating force for racial, social equality, and interracial cooperation. Additionally, the younger generation of black women have shown little interest in continuing the rich legacy of their foremothers. In spite of this, Charleston's black club women fervently strive to continue the tradition of "Lifting As We Climb" in their service to the black community and black womanhood. Indeed, Charleston's black club women truly were and continue to be "Loyal Women of Palmetto."

South Carolina Federation Song
Written by Mrs. L.A.J. Moorer, Orangeburg, SC
Tune: The Battle Hymn of the Republic

As the many, many streamlets go from the river grand,
As the palm, the thumb and fingers make the lovely human hand;
So the clubs of Carolina as a unit bravely stand--
We're lifting as we climb.

Chorus
We are women of Palmetto
Loyal women of Palmetto
By our labors in Palmetto
We are lifting as we climb.

In the fight for prohibition we will conquer though we die;
We'll exalt the cause of virtue till the vice away shall die,
Making home the type of heaven, causing wrong to fear and fly
We're lifting as we climb.

Education is our watchword, bidding ignorance adieu;
In the civic life we labor for the beautiful and true;
So the gloom of night we're chasing while the dawning comes anew
We're lifting as we climb.[52]

ENDNOTES

[1]Fannie B. Williams, "Club Movement Among Negro Women," J.W. Gibson and W.H. Crogman The Colored American From Slavery to Honorable Citizenship. (Atlanta: J.L. Nichols & Co., 1903), 197.

[2]Darlene Clark Hine, "We Specialize in the Wholly Impossible": The Philanthropic Work of Black Women." in Kathleen D. McCarthy ed. Lady Bountiful Revisited: Women, Philanthropy and Power. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990), 70.; Charles H. Wesley, The History of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs: A Legacy of Service. (Washington, D.C.: Mercury Press, 1984), 1.

[3]Dorothy Salem, To Better Our World: Black Women in Organized Reform, 1890-1920. (Brooklyn: Carlson Publishing Inc., 1990), 7.

[4]Walter J. Fraser, Jr. Charleston! Charleston!: The History of a Southern City. (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1989), 308.

[5]Robert N. Rosen, A Short History of Charleston. (San Francisco: Lexikos, 1982), 138; Fraser, 336.

[6]Joel Williamson, After Slavery: The Negro in South Carolina During Reconstruction, 1861-1877 (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1965), 238.

[7]Rosen, 137.

[8]Ibid., 138.

[9]Rosen, 8.

[10]Williams, 197.; Stephanie J. Shaw, "Black Club Women and the Creation of the National Association of Colored Women," Darlene C. Hine, "We Specialize in the Wholly Impossible": A Reader in Black Women's History. (Brooklyn: Carlson Publishing., 1995), 433.

[11]Gerda Lerner ed., Black Women in White America: A Documentary History, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), 436.

[12]Salem, 7.;Gerda Lerner, "Early Community Work of Black Club Women." The Journal of Negro History, Vol. LIX, No.2 (April 1974), 159.; Booker T. Washington, A New Negro for a New Century: An Accurate and Up-to-Date Record of the Upward Struggles of the Negro Race. (Chicago: American Publishing House, 1900), 379.

[13]Mrs. J. C. Croly, The History of the Woman's Club Movement in America. (New York: Henry Allen & Co., 1898), ix.

[14]Anne F. Scott, Natural Allies: Women's Associations in America History. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 126-127.

[15]Lerner, Black Women in White America, 437.

[16]Interview, Ms. Thelma I. Washington, 11 February 1997, 171 Congress St. Charleston, South Carolina.

[17]Mamie Garvin Fields Collection, Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture, College of Charleston, Charleston, South Carolina, Box 3.

[18]Mamie Garvin Fields, Lemon Swamp and Other Places: A Carolina Memoir. (New York: The Free Press, 1983), 190-191.; Darlene Clark Hine, Black Women in America: An Historical Encyclopedia, Volume I, A-L. (New York: Carlson Publishing, 1993), 428.

[19]Edmund L. Drago, Initiative, Paternalism, and Race Relations: Charleston's Avery

Normal Institute. (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1990), 148.; The Avery Normal Institute was organized in October of 1865 by Francis L. Cardozo, and the American Missionary Association. Its curriculum offered classical training and many of its graduates became teachers. From Bernard E. Powers, Jr. Black Charlestonians: A Social History, 1822-1885. (Fayetteville: The University of Arkansas Press, 1994), 139, 152.

[20]The Phyllis Wheatley Literary and Social Club Collection, Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture, College of Charleston, Charleston, South Carolina, Box 1, Folder 2.

[21]The Phyllis Wheatley Literary and Social Club Collection, Box 1, Folder 2.

[22]Phyllis Wheatley Collection, Box 1 Folder 1.

[23]Ibid., Minutes, December 14, 1916, Box 1.

[24]History, Phyllis Wheatley, 6.

[25]Phyllis Wheatley Collection., 44.

[26]Drago, 149.

[27]Minutes, Phyllis Wheatley Collection, January 9, 1917.

[28]Ibid., January 31, 1918.

[29]History, Phyllis Wheatley, 1.

[30]Ibid., 6.

[31]Interview, Thelma I. Washington, 11 February 1997.

[32]Lemon Swamp, 199.

[33]Field, 197.; Mamie Garvin Fields Collection, Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture, College of Charleston, Charleston, South Carolina, Box 3.

[34]Drago, 172.

[35]History, Phyllis Wheatley, 17.

[36]Drago, 150.

[37]History, Phyllis Wheatley, 18.

[38]Lemon Swamp, 192-193.

[39]History, Phyllis Wheatley, 2.; Drago, 169.

[40]History, Phyllis Wheatley, 7.

[41]History, Phyllis Wheatley, 13.; Drago, 169.

[42]Drago, 169.

[43]Lemon Swamp, 198.

[44]Lemon Swamp., 198.

[45]Ibid., 198.

[46]Ibid., 193.

[47]Interview, Mrs. Ruby P. Cornwell, 11 November 1996, 243 St. Margaret Street, Charleston, South Carolina.

[48]Interview, Mrs. Cynthia McCottry Smith, 12 November 1996, Avery Research Center for African American History & Culture, College of Charleston, Charleston, South Carolina.

[49]Gerda Lerner, "Early Community Work of Black Club Women", 167.

[50]Williams, 206.

[51]Cynthia Neverdon-Morton, Afro-American Women of the South and the Advancement of the Race, 1895-1925. (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1989), 201.

[52]Mamie Garvin Fields Collection, Box 3.

ENDNOTES

South Carolina's Board of Indian Commissioners and the Struggle to Control the Public Indian Trade

Images of the Indian trade in the colonial Southeast might bring to mind crude, ill-fashioned objects which no "civilized" European might want. Yet, how many British colonies in North America survived physically because of produce, game and skins sold to them by Indians? The Indian trade was one reason American colonials achieved a higher standard of living than their British counterparts by 1750 A.D.. Indeed, it was the wealth acquired from the Indian trade in deer skins which allowed South Carolinian planters to later invest in rice and indigo plantations and African slaves.[1] Financially, colonial South Carolina had a love affair, of sorts, with the trade in white tail deer skins. From 1699 until 1715, South Carolina exported an average of 54,000 skins annually. In 1706, that number peaked at 121, 335 skins. There were periodic slumps in the trade, however, such as the one between 1716 to 1730. The industry rebounded around 1730 and by 1748 South Carolina was again exporting great annual numbers, such as 160,000 sk:ns for that year.[2] With respect to monetary wealth, that amount of exported skins translated to values worth £250,000-300,000.[3] The trade, its intendant wealth and inherent conflicts prompted the government of South Carolina to assume an innovative role in trying to monitor and control the Indian trade in the early 1700s, some fifty years before the British government's efforts to do likewise for all its North American colonies.

As the backcountry Indian trade grew to such profitable proportions, the lure of its wealth attracted more and more Euroamerican traders hoping to make their fortune. In time, questionable trade practices by these merchants prompted colonies like South Carolina to monitor both the Indian trade and its traders for obvious security reasons. Shoddy trade practices could ignite a costly conflict between two tribes or a tribe and its Euroamerican neighbors. Perhaps more disturbing was the influence such traders had in colonial politics, manipulating the appointments and dismissals of governors as far back as 1685. Carolina's proprietors wrote to one early governor with disturbing reports that the colony's Indian traders bragged they could, ". . .with a bowl of punch get who they would chosen to the parliament and afterwards who they would chosen to the Grand Council."[4] At the very least, the traders were men of influence, often called to the colonial assembly to advise about situations on borders shared with the Spanish or French.[5] By the decade of the Great War for Empire, tensions between American Indians and colonial Americans were such the British colonial government felt compelled to monitor its colonies for potential Indian conflicts, as South Carolina had tried to do in the early 1700s.

When British settlers began to occupy North America, they found a tradition of gift-giving among Native American peoples. They also inherited a legacy of trade previously established by earlier, aggressive, European colonizers. James Needham and Gabriel Arthur, early British traders among the Cherokees, found that those people had previously traded with the Spanish in Florida for a long time. The British travelers found trade connections to Virginia suppliers through an intermediate group of Indians, the Occaneechees of southwestern Virginia. Interestingly enough, when Needham attempted to supplant the Occaneechees' position as middlemen, they had him killed in September 1673.[6] During Robert La Salle's 1682 trip down the Mississippi River, he encountered utensils and clothing of European origin which he surmised had come west from trade with Carolina.[7]

Though South Carolina's neighboring tribes were eager to establish trade ties with colonial powers, they paid a heavy price for that trade in many ways. With trade came disease, often borne on the very articles for which Native Americans of the Southeast traded. James Adair, an eighteenth century

southern trader, noted the degree to which smallpox affected tribes with which he traded when he recorded that the Cherokees, whom he considered a proud people, sometimes committed suicide rather than live with the lasting disfigurement of smallpox scars.[8] Beyond the psychological discomfort of survivable diseases, lay the insurmountable damage of social devastation as entire communities were eliminated due to disease passed through trade. Even simple diplomatic exchanges between native peoples and Europeans began with an exchange of gifts between the two peoples and carried an unforseen but deadly risk.[9]

For colonials, the Indian trade quickly became an avenue through which men sought to find easy wealth. Men like Lachlan McGillivray emigrated from Scotland during harsh economic times to seek their fortunes in the southern backcountry as Indian traders. McGillivray, one of the more famous Indian traders, is a fitting example from which to create a model. The fur traders were, in the majority, Scots, Irish or Scot-Irish.[10] William Byrd II of Westover Plantation in Virginia, further defines the model by noting that such men got their start by sending to Britain for trade goods either in payment of cash if they had it or on credit to be paid with skins bartered from the Indians. Writing in the year 1728, Byrd observed such wares might include, first and foremost, guns and ammunition. After those items, Indians desired such things as hatchets, knives, vermilion, duffield blankets, calico cloth, hats, broadcloth coats and girdles.[11] Once procured, these items were loaded onto packhorses in amounts from 150-200 pounds. Near the beginning of the eighteenth century, Byrd noted that horse caravans often consisted of up to 100 animals accompanied by 15 to 16 people. By 1728 however, he estimated that such horse trains seldom reached half those numbers of animals or men.[12] Native peoples of Carolina, and the Southeast in general, traded the skins of the white tail deer for the merchandise brought on these packhorses. For a sixteen year period starting in 1699, Native hunters supplied South Carolina with deerskin exports averaging 54,000 skins per year. After 1715, that annual average would jump to 150,000 deerskins.[13]

Indians hunted during the winter months on forays lasting weeks at a time. After killing the animals, primarily deer in South Carolina, they skinned them in hunting lodges in the woods. It was not until late spring that these hunting parties returned to their villages. There, the traders were waiting for them in order to receive payment for the previous year's debt and hopefully to accumulate one for the next year. These deer skins were tied into bundles and loaded onto horses for a return trip to towns like Charles Town where the trader often had his own creditor waiting. Traders of various tribes often formed a single caravan as they journeyed out of the backcountry and returned to Euroamerican towns. By late summer or early fall, they had acquired new goods and returned to the backcountry to start the cycle again. Traders often located permanently among Indian peoples in those towns which produced the most skins.[14] This practice left some towns undersupplied, often contributing to jealousy and an upsurge in intra-tribal disputes, as well as those between Euroamericans and Indians. Compared to the material scarcity of the surrounding Indians, these backcountry bourgeois lived lives of comfort in homes tended by their Indian mates, filled with mixed-blood children. The dwelling necessarily contained store-rooms for their trade goods. The trader also brought pastoral farming to the towns in which they lived.[15]

While the Indian trade could provide a comfortable living, it was a financial gamble involving an intricate credit structure somewhat analogous to that of the ante-bellum cotton planter. Often the agency supplying trade goods was based in London. It provided wares on credit to a colonial merchant in places like Charles Town; that merchant then supplied the trader with the Indian goods needed for the backcountry trade. In trading with the Indians, the fur trader often was taking payment in skins for goods purchased the previous year and selling goods to be paid with the next winter's hunt.[16] From the trader's perspective, tribal hunters faring poorly one winter were customers who could not pay the debt for previously purchased goods. Likewise if the tribe was engaged in warfare and unable to hunt, their debts went unpaid and they incurred the wrath of the trader and his creditors.[17]

If the deer skin trade was a financial gamble for Euroamericans, it wreaked cultural havoc with the lifestyles of American Indians, as native craft skills had to compete with often more durable mass-produced goods from Europe. Since calico cloth and metal skillets were more utilitarian than animal skins and wooden bowls, North America's native peoples allowed some craft skills to languish as they adapted to European merchandise. Adaption in many cases quickly led to dependence.[18] Thus, while Indian communities of the Southeast experienced a growing dependence on Euroamerican culture, the traders who provided the merchandise competed among each other, often with deadly results for their own communities and those with whom they traded. These economic difficulties only compounded the competition among Indian traders. Writing about competing Georgia Indian traders in 1752, Carolina Indian trader Ludovic Grant described them as, ". . . a monstrous sett [sic] of rogues for the major part of whom the gallows groans."[19] Though borne of the jealousy of competition, Grant's statement sadly reflects the disposition and intent of a significant number of Euroamerican men who had an important part in shaping the relationship between the two cultures in the backcountry. The Creeks told Indian trader James Adair that the Choctaw word for traders was derisive; when translated it meant something akin to, ". . . contemptible heterogenous animal."[20] Bernard Romans, a traveler in lower Georgia and upper Florida in the early 1770s, harshly characterized the Indian traders, stating, ". . . those monsters in human form, the very scum and out cast of the earth, are always more prone to savage barbarity than the savages themselves; . . ."[21] Traders of this ilk coined the phrase, "it's no crime to cheat and gull an Indian."[22] Those who most influenced Indian relations were often the worst ambassadors of their culture.

Where commerce and corruption flourished, government regulation was sure to follow. The imposition of rules and regulations over the Indian trade in the Carolina backcountry suggests three admissions on the part of colonial government. First, it meant that the Indian trade was valuable. Edward McCrady, an early historian of South Carolina, noted that all the family fortunes in colonial Carolina were based on the Indian trade.[23] Second, the establishment of trade guidelines meant that the relationship between the colony and surrounding tribes could be dangerous, even fatal. Indeed, a 1736 article in the South Carolina Gazette discussed the diplomatic importance of the trade, stating its principal value was in the maintenance of friendly relations with surrounding tribes.[24] Finally, the creation of a regulatory system was proof that free traders were jeopardizing that relationship. Southern Historian Verner Crane believed that South Carolina government was more preoccupied with Indian administration than any other colony, based on administration records.[25]

South Carolina, like the earlier colony of Virginia, was surrounded by native peoples. It had contact with smaller Native American groups like the Congarees, Pee Dees, Waterees, Santees and Catawbas who were located along the Catawba, Santee and Pee Dee Rivers and Euroamerican settlements like Charles Town. To the south and west it had contact with tribes including the Muskoghees of Eastern Georgia and the Alabamas and Uchees of Eastern Alabama, groups labeled "Creeks," by Euroamericans. It also had access to the Cherokees of Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, Georgia and Tennessee. It is not surprising then that one of the earliest governmental attempts to regulate contact and trade between Native American and Euroamerican culture in the Southeast came from South Carolina. The South Carolina assembly enacted a law in 1707 creating a Board of Indian Commissioners to license and regulate traders going into Indian lands. The act provided for a superintendent assigned to live among each of the tribes in order to enforce fair trade practices decided by the commissioners. Traders had to purchase an annual license for £8 and give a bond of £100 to guarantee compliance with the new trade rules. Traders were not to seize free Indians and sell them as slaves[26] to cancel Indian debts nor to force native peoples to trade furs under threat of physical violence. While they could sell arms and ammunition to Indians who had treaties with the government of Carolina, traders were not to trade with so-called "enemy" Indians who were aligned with either France or Spain. Finally, they were not to give or to sell rum to the Indians.[27]

Such a noble regulatory effort immediately met with opposition from the heretofore free traders who had done as they pleased in the anonymity of the backcountry. In August 1711, the Indian Commissioners of South Carolina reprimanded a trader named Frazier for selling an Indian boy. Further, Frazier was guilty of trading without a license. His punishment was to forfeit his £100 bond, to discharge the debt owed him by Indians for rum, and to release those Indians indebted to him through debts of their relatives.[28] Four days later, the commissioners decided to look into two cases of abduction with intent to sell. Cornelius McCarty was being investigated for taking an Indian man's wife and child while the man was away at war. George Wright was being investigated for abducting a free Indian woman from her home in Tomatly.[29]

The growing number of trader irregularities did nothing to stem the tide of applicants. In September 1711, the South Carolina Indian Board met and issued fifteen new trader licenses and sets of guidelines. Yet it also had to discuss the incidence of rum being sold to Indians by Edmund Ellis, John Cochran, William Ford, Samuel Hilden and Nicholas Day.[30] Most items of Euroamerican trade brought a psychological addiction; rum was a trade item which promoted physical addiction as well. Travelers in the backcountry reported finding Indian bodies piled in the forest--dead and reeking of alcohol. By altering perception and judgment, rum and its illegal trafficking in the backcountry further exacerbated relationships between the two cultures. Unscrupulous traders often intercepted warriors returning home from a hunt before they reached their village, offering these men a free drink of rum and then insisting on trading. Drinking continued past the first, friendly drink until the warriors were drunk and, in such a state, they were easy prey for the traders.[31]

Alcohol was an especially dangerous trade item for native peoples. The addiction it brought led tribes to over-hunt their game lands in order to purchase rum. Eventually depleting their own hunting grounds, tribes would then encroach upon the game lands of other Native American peoples, thus increasing inter-tribal warfare.[32] In addition to the introduction and support of an addiction, dishonest traders plying Indians with liquor created tension on an economic level between the tribes and colonial governments as well. Since the Indians procured skins to pay the previous year's debt, they incurred the wrath of their own creditors when they returned empty-handed as victims of ruthless traders. Indian debts began to accumulate while the Indians became victims of substance abuse. John Lawson, a traveler in the Carolinas around 1700, reported that the traders sold the Indians rum by the mouthful in exchange for buckskins. However unhygienic the measuring, the Indians soon learned to bring to the negotiating table the man with the biggest mouth in the village.[33] The Carolina Board of Commissioners tried to regulate the liquor traffic. In August of 1713, they notified the traders of the Savannah and Yamassee Indian settlements of reports of large amounts of rum being shipped into their territories; they ordered their agents to seek out and destroy the contraband.[34] The efficacy of the board to deal with such matters had always been tenuous as they were far removed from the day-to-day dealings with Native Americans. They might order free traders to carry out certain edicts but in the expanse of the backcountry, their only means of enforcing these policies was their agent. Part of the original act of 1707 called for the creation of that agent who was to spend at least ten months of the year in the Indian homelands. Carolina's first was Thomas Nairne followed later by John Wright.[35] The agent received £250 in compensation for his efforts and was charged with visiting all main Indian settlements, handling Indian complaints and generally managing the trade.[36]

Nairne, a wealthy business man, supported the 1707 bill creating a pro-trader regulatory commission.[37] After traveling among the Yamassees near Port Royal sound, Wright, the second agent, traveled among the Savannah Indians at the modern location of Augusta, Georgia. In March 1712, he told the board that none of the traders he met during his journey had licenses.[38] As South Carolina's first Indian agent, one of Nairne's initial tasks was to arrest James Child for leading Cherokees on a slave raid against pro-British Indians, which netted 160 captives.[39] In 1712, Nairne was made a commissioner to the

Yamassee and Palachocola Indians and he came into conflict with his replacement as Indian agent, John Wright, over jurisdiction. Wright's office ultimately was given superior authority, but Nairne returned to the office as Indian agent later the same year, displacing Wright.[40] In August of 1714, the board authorized Nairne to arrest Wright, its own former agent, for rum trafficking in the Indian lands.[41] Thus the loyalty of the board's own employees was questionable, as was its efficacy in regulating the Indian trade.

In addition to liquor, guns became a prominent trade item. Like more mundane items, guns also radically changed Native American culture. The gun increased the efficacy of native hunters in their struggle against the white-tail deer. Indeed, the race to collect more deer skins to buy both rum and guns led Indian hunters to exhaust their game reserves. At the same time, native religious taboos applied in hunting that acted to limit kills, out of respect to the both the animals and a benevolent supreme being, fell by the wayside.[42] European guns also contributed to native dependency on Euroamerican traders. In addition to its greater killing power than the bow and arrow, the gun's loud shot helped frighten enemies. Gun wounds were often more serious than those of arrows and could develop critical complications. The gun became a prominent factor in tribal life after European contact as traditional warfare motives of revenge and honor were joined by such motives as the desire to dominate Euroamerican trade lines, to seize hunting lands of other native peoples or to secure slaves to sell to Euroamerican traders.[43] Indeed, contact with Euroamerican culture completely changed the style and duration of Indian warfare, as native peoples began to practice "total war", sparing no prisoners, destroying an enemy's resources and practicing siege tactics.[44] While Euroamerican trade items were indirectly changing native lifeways, traders were deliberately changing those same traditions.

Along with deerskins, lawless traders often intercepted warriors returning home with slaves taken in raids to sell. These slaves were usually members of other tribes taken in raids, but Indians also trafficked in African-Americans. In April 1712, the board was notified that a trader named Hilden had intercepted a group of Indians and forced them to exchange their slaves for trade items. Wenoya, an Indian man, noted that Hilden had forced him to trade a slave for items worth 160 skins.[45] The next month, the board received complaints that William Bray, Daniel Callahaun and John Frazier forced Indians returning to Pocotalligo Town to sell their slaves.[46]

Members of various tribes began to register complaints as Indian head men vainly sought stricter regulation of rum smuggling in their homelands. Tribal leaders told colonial officials that the trade in alcohol was the source of much dissension between their people and the colonials.[47] By 1711, the rum debt of Carolina Indians stood at 100,000 skins, easily two year's work for trappers.[48] In April 1715, the Creek Indians notified the Board of Commissioners that they were dissatisfied with the traders among them, especially one John Jones. Their warning was the latest of many complaints made without satisfaction. Their latest complaint carried an implicit threat, showing another inherent danger in the job of Indian trader. The Creeks told the board that any further offenses from the traders would bring retaliation upon all of their number by the tribe.[49]

Despite the growing tension, new traders flocked to the profession. Only a few months before, twenty-three men took out licenses to trade.[50] Thus the potentially dangerous relationship between Native Americans and colonials in Carolina was reaching a critical stage. In fact, as early as 1711, approximately 400 Yamassee warriors owed their creditors more than 100,000 deerskins for goods bought on credit.[51] By early 1715, the Yamassee debt had escalated to £50,000[52] and economic tensions reached critical mass in mid April 1715. On 14 April 1715, William Bray and Samuel Warner met Thomas Nairne at Pocotalligo Town pursuant to a mission to head off an impending Indian attack by the Yamassees. The Yamassees had become accustomed to slave hunting to pay their trade debts and had habitually preyed upon the Appalachee Indians of northern Florida. Now, numerous raids had depleted the ranks of the Florida tribes and lacking the means to pay an exhorbitant debt but still harassed by their

creditors, the Yamassees turned on them on 15 April 1715. They killed Bray and Warner, but tortured Nairne for three days before he died. The Yamassee uprising lasted two years and threatened the survival of South Carolina.[53]

In response to the Yamassee disaster, the government of South Carolina in 1716 assumed a monopoly over the fur trade with the backcountry, replacing often unruly agents with official representatives or factors. These new employees would replace the old agent and would be stationed at designated points within each of the tribes aligned with Carolina. Their duty was to take direct charge of the trading goods sent up by the board and exchange them for the skins and slaves previously bought from licensed, but ungovernable traders.[54] The new system had been advocated for some time by Carolina planters who dabbled in the Indian trade--it had been opposed for years by merchants who saw it as a disastrous dimunition of profit.[55] Like their predecessors, the factors could sell arms and ammunition to aligned tribes but not to those known to deal with the Spanish or French. They were also forbidden to enslave free Indians from tribes aligned with Britain. Addressing the issue of accumulated Indian debts which had ignited the Yamassee conflict, the board forbade the factors to extend credit to the Indians even for as little as one skin's value. The factors were not to trade with the Indians on a private basis, only representing the public trade. Factors were supposed to mark items bartered from the Indians with a particular brand and were to maintain the pack animals and other conveyances used in the trade in a proper manner. The factors were to keep an "exact" journal to record not only information relative to the Indian trade but all proceedings within their assigned tribe.[56]

Factors were to note the deaths of any prominent Indians, especially those that held commissions from the government of Carolina. In such an event, the board expected the factor to make a recommendation on a suitable successor. The factors were to report the incidence of murder among their hosts, as well as to note that tribe's policy toward other Indians. They were to note the departure and arrival of other tribesmen, as well as of emissaries of other colonial powers. Factors were to keep accounts of the number of fighting men in their tribe and be able to identify them as head men, warriors or beloved men.[57] Thus, the factors were becoming true backcountry diplomats to many diverse Indian groups and modifying their culture through the imposition of foreign, hierarchical systems like the commissions.

The factors were to remain dependent officials, however, lacking the power to invoke the word of colonial government without authorization from the board. One of their functions was to see that Indians continued to stay away from towns, where they might cause mischief and incur diplomatic expenses. Indians were to become accustomed to trading with the factor at his factory. Out of seventeen points of instruction, trade guidelines dominated the first twelve entries. Guideline number thirteen did charge the factors to maintain friendly relations with the Indians by striving to end abuses by colonials.[58] Nonetheless, prioritization of points indicate that Indian abuse was viewed mainly as an impediment to trade, despite the threat to Euroamerican settlers.

Other officials were involved as well. Thomas Barton served as store keeper for the Board of Indian Commissioners. In keeping the repository of trade goods, Barton had to take an oath of service, swearing not to embezzle the goods, nor trade directly with the Indians.[59] Obviously, the 1716 *Act for the Better Regulation of the Indian Trade* intended to eliminate one official--the independent trader. The act also sought to eliminate the competition posed by free traders, whose growing numbers effectively lowered the profit of all and encouraged the baser behavior on the part of some of them in order to make a living. Any private trader arrested under the act would pay the rather exorbitant fine of £500 while his goods were liable to be sold by the factor for the public trade.[60] Such stiff penalties and the curtailment of free enterprise were bound to arouse the ire of many of the Scotch-Irish free traders.

While the profession of Indian trader was often a temporary one for many adventurous souls in the backcountry, it was a lifetime profession for several as well. The Carolina Trade Act of 1716 posed a

great threat to men like Eleazar Wiggan. Wiggan had entered the Overhills Cherokee country (modern Western North Carolina-Eastern Tennessee) around 1711. In 1715, the South Carolina government employed him to bring the Cherokees to the aid of the colony during the Yamassee attack. He also escorted military officials, like Colonel George Chicken, on missions into the backcountry.[61] Due to the imposition of government regulation, men like Wiggan would have to decide whether to quit their profession, be absorbed by the new system and become public traders, or live beyond the law and take their chances.

Though Eleazar Wiggan provided Cherokee warriors for a South Carolina besieged by the Yamassees, in July 1716 the board chastised him for his failure to comply with the new law. They acknowledged that they had given him permission previously to pursue his "small trade," but that they had never intended that trade to go on so long. The board could not allow his efforts to clash with the public trade and so gave him six days to evacuate Cherokee lands. The new public trader to the Cherokees, Theophilus Hastings, was ordered to seize his goods if he did not comply.[62]
In October 1716, Wiggan's name was back before the board as it issued orders that he be prosecuted. He evidently had departed the Cherokee lands but had taken up a trade with the Catawba people, again without a position as public trader.[63] Ultimately, Wiggan was absorbed by the new system for in January 1717 the board accepted him as a factor to the Catawba people.[64] In such a position, he proved a valuable servant to the board over the years.

As Native Americans of the Southeast grew more dependent upon European goods, they grew more vocal in their demands about trade practices. The imposition of a government monopoly over the trade did not solve many pre-existing problems, but allowed for more efficient reporting of Indian grievances. Soon after the imposition of these prices, various tribes began to protest. In a November 1716 session of the board, a letter from factor Theophilus Hastings noted that the Cherokees considered the prices charged for certain items, like strouds, too costly.[65] Scarcely six days later, the board moved to reduce the cost of strouds from eight skins per yard to seven.[66] Such price rollbacks illustrate colonial fears that the Indians would turn violent or align with other powers.

In 1717, the factors experienced one of those dread fears--traders of rival powers. If the southeastern Indian tribes had been isolated from other trading powers, their demands for cheaper goods would have fallen on deaf ears. Alternative suppliers, however, meant threats to Carolina's hegemony and those suppliers were not always French of Spanish. In May 1717, the board wrote Meredith Hughes, factor to the Wineaus, that the Virginians were encroaching upon what Carolina had considered its preserve--trade with the southeastern Indians.[67] Scarcely a week later, Eleazar Wiggan, firmly re-established in the Indian trade as a factor to the Catawbas, reported that his hosts also spoke of an impending visit by Virginia traders with whom they promised not to trade.[68] Virginia traders threatened the hegemony of Carolina over the southern Indians, increased the numbers of an already glutted profession and threatened to create a price war for customers. In September 1717, the board noted a report from Eleazar Wiggan stating that Virginia traders in his region intimated they would undersell Carolina traders in order to secure tribal loyalty. The board directed Wiggan to provide them with detailed reports concerning these rivals, including their prices, and ordered Wiggan to make drastic cuts of merchandise prices to match Virginia trade prices.[69]

With the influx of more traders into the backcountry, the competition lowered the profit for all. Traders began to locate in native towns with the most hunters, and such towns were oversupplied with goods while smaller towns often went undersupplied. Indeed, the presence of Euroamerican traders often split tribal loyalties within one group based on differing economic alliances between factions in that tribe. The Cherokees of modern Western North Carolina shifted loyalties by the mid eighteenth century to the French while those of modern Western South Carolina remained attached to the British.[70] Yet various tribes began to wield a bargaining power they held over Carolina government with more finesse.

In May 1718, Eleazar Wiggan reported to the board that the Catawbas felt they were not supplied with sufficient goods. They also complained of the colonial practice of using Indian males as burdeners to transport wares to and from the East. The Catawbas cited the Virginians as proper trading partners to Wiggan; they had brought great quantities of goods which they had sold more cheaply than Carolina factors had done. Finally, the merchandise had been shipped on packhorses.[71] In response, the board sent Wiggan presents for the Catawba head man and his sister. They told Wiggan to notify the Catawbas to expect the arrival of a proper load of merchandise--on packhorses. The board also created a new backcountry official--the packhorseman and assigned several of them to the various tribes much as it had done the factors. The packhorsemen were, like the traders and Indian agents, directly involved in daily life in the Indian lands and helped shape the relationship between Native American and Euroamerican culture. Once among the Indian tribes, the packhorsemen passed from the jurisdiction of the board to that of the factors.[72] Some packhorsemen, like Lachlan McGillivray, advanced from the job of packhorseman to that of trader.[73]

However they entered the trade, backcountry officials could wield surprising power that could either smooth or exacerbate tensions between the two cultures. David Dowey was a Euroamerican trader stationed along the Overhill towns of the Cherokee people in modern Monroe County, Tennessee. In a report to the board, he noted that the Indians there were generally helpful to the traders living among them. It was the traders who disrupted relations with the Indians by spreading both lies and rum among them, in order to attract their business. Dowey noted that a man named William Broadway had recently told the Indians there that, ". . . the people of South Carolina were raising an army to cutt [sic] them all to peices, [sic] and to make slaves of their wives and children."[74]

Behind the scenes of the public trade, a fierce battle waged. Carolina merchants resented the exclusion of free traders from the new public trade. They petitioned the Carolina Proprietors to reverse the public monopoly and, in 1718, enjoyed the repeal of the public trade act. Rather than destroy the system altogether, however, it was replaced with a curious hybrid organization which blended both public and private traders. The public traders were reorganized into three factors and three subfactors in charge of sixty employees. Public trade continued at designated factories and private traders were prohibited from trading with twenty miles of these sites. Where the public trade did not exist, private traders were now welcome and public traders could not encroach in the new private domain. Profits from the public trade funded the upkeep of garrisons and trading forts in the backcountry. A ten percent tax on the private trade was levied for the same causes.[75]

Whether public or private, the traders' position was not without a certain amount of danger itself. When angered by Euroamericans, various tribes often turned on those representatives closest to them--the traders and their assistants. In December 1749, South Carolina Governor James Glen, in a report to the Board of Trade, mentioned that a group of French-influenced Indians had killed a trader named Robert Kelley during a raid on the Overhill Cherokees. Glen felt Kelley's loss was a blow to the government since he had lived among them long enough to learn their language and their customs.[76] James Maxwell, a trader assigned to the Lower Cherokees, near the headwaters of the Savannah and Chattahoochee Rivers, reported in June of 1751 that a group of Cherokees went on a rampage and killed a trader named Daniel Murphy and had proceeded on to the store of Bernard Hughes intending to kill its owner, though Hughes had fled. These same Indians declared that the remaining traders and their merchandise would be held as hostages in the Cherokee lands till the Carolina government sent them ammunition.[77]

Carolina responded to the hostage situation with a very powerful weapon--the cessation of trade. Cornelius Dougherty wrote Governor Glen in July 1751 that, acting on the governor's orders, he had held a meeting of traders to inform them they were being ordered out of tribal lands until the disruptive faction

among the Cherokees could be brought under control. To that end, Dougherty also held a meeting with several Cherokee head men to tell them why the traders were being evacuated.[78]

By mid-eighteenth century, the number of Indian factors combined with those illegal independent traders had grown to such numbers that none involved in the trade was making a profit. A memorial made by Cherokee traders Robert Bunning, Cornelius Dougherty, James Beamer and Ludovic Grant noted that the trade was so low that they could not pay merchants for old debts, much less purchase new goods. They also advocated the creation of a new official who would live among the various tribes with the power to regulate the trade properly. Finally, they suggested the building of British forts throughout the backcountry. Garrisoned with soldiers, these forts would enforce the trade policies so often ignored by wayward traders in the wilds of inland Carolina and Georgia. The forts would serve also as visible reminders to the Indians of the relationship between themselves and the British, helping to minimize the influence of traders from other colonies and nations.[79]

The memorial by veteran traders like Bunning, Grant, Dougherty and Beamer was prophetic with regard to some grand solutions for Indian trade problems proposed that very year . In 1751 a member of the Governor's Council of New York, Archibald Kennedy, suggested the creation of an Indian superintendent. He found an advocate in New York's Governor Cadwallader Colden, who forwarded the idea to the Board of Trade in the fall of 1751.[80] They called for an official who would enforce just treatment of the Indians, mediate their grievances when they had been ill-used and supply them with craftsmen and missionaries. Ironically, the source of this official's salary would be obtained from the sale of liquor--that trade item which had wreaked so much havoc in relations between the two cultures.[81]
The next call for the creation of such a colonial official came at the Albany Congress of 1754 when William Johnson presented a paper stressing the importance of securing the firm loyalties of America's Indian tribes in light of the impending war with France. Representatives of the six tribes of the Iroquois Confederacy (Hodenosaunee) also petitioned the Congress for the creation of such an official and the Congress, in turn, endorsed the idea to the Secretary of State for the Southern Department on 22 July 1754.[82]

Lord Halifax, Secretary of State for the Southern Department chose to use the plan submitted by the Albany Congress. He proposed to divide North America into two districts presided over by two commissary generals, later called superintendents, regulating diplomatic and trade relations with the various tribes. They, not colonial governments, would issue licenses to traders, thus depriving those governments of expected revenue and power. These commissioners would require assistants in the field, much as the factors employed by the Carolina government had employed assistants; the pay for both would come from a general fund for the government of the colonies.[83]

One of the most frustrating weaknesses of the Indian agents appointed by colonial governments was their lack of ability to enforce policy dictated from colonial centers of power. The new Indian superintendents were placed under the authority of the Commander-in-Chief of British Forces in North America, Major General Edward Braddock. Braddock was instructed to select the agents for both districts; for the North he chose William Johnson and for the South, Edmund Atkin. John Stuart initially assisted Atkin but upon Atkin's death, Stuart assumed the superintendent's post on 5 January 1762.[84]
The shift from individual colonial control of contiguous tribes to a centralized, bureaucratic effort to regulate relations with America's Indian peoples marked the first stage of home government involvement. Colonies, like South Carolina, were now made subordinate under supracolonial control, and often chafed at the new restraints. While the Indian trade would now receive thorough scrutiny from a pan-colonial perspective, the new administration would struggle with the same problems first experienced by the South Carolina Board of Commissioners and their agents. Stuart and his assistants would wrestle with liquor sales, Euroamerican land encroachment and hostility between the two cultures just as their earlier Carolina predecessors had done. Some of those new officials, including John Stuart, had gotten their

apprenticeship in Anglo-Indian diplomacy in the Carolina backcountry. One historian of the Carolina frontier, Verner Crane, offered the opinion that South Carolina's Indian management system was probably the best of any such colonial organization and the only superior Indian Regulatory agency was that created by the British Colonial government in 1756.[85] While colonial Carolina could not claim discovery of easy solutions to conflicts between Euroamerican and Native American cultures, it could rightfully claim credit for pioneering efforts attempting to do so through a public trade managed by the Board of Indian Commissioners.

ENDNOTES

[1].Philip M. Brown, "Early Indian Trade in the Development of South Carolina: Politics, Economics, and Social Mobility During the Proprietary Period, 1670-1719," The South Carolina Historical Magazine, 76 (1975): 118.

[2].W.O. Moore, Jr., "The Largest Exporters of Deerskins From Charles Town, 1735-1755," The South Carolina Historical Magazine, 74 (1973): 144-145. Moore noted that the trade only began to slack off when supplanted by Indigo production in the 1740s.

[3].Mary U. Rothrock, "Carolina Traders Among The Overhill Cherokees, 1690-1760," East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications, 1 (1929): 4.

[4].Brown, "Early Indian Trade,": 119.

[5].Verner W. Crane. The Southern Frontier: 1670-1732, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1964), 108-109.

[6].Rothrock, "Carolina Traders," : 10. At the time of heaviest contact between the English and the Cherokees, the latter were typically found in modern Western South Carolina, Western North Carolina, Eastern Tennessee and Northern Alabama and Northern Georgia.

[7].Ibid., : 5.

[8].James L. Axtell. The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 250.

[9].Ibid., 253.

[10].Rothrock,"Carolina Traders," : 7-8. License records reveal such family names as Campbell, Dougherty, Gillespie, McGillivray, McKinney, McIntosh, MacDonald, McCormick, Millikin and McBain. See Crane, The Southern Frontier, 125.

[11].William L. McDowell, Colonial Records of South Carolina: Journals of the Commissioners of the Indian Trade, September 20, 1710-August 29, 1718, 1: 89. Hereafter referred to as Indian Book 1 (out of 3). Vermillion or red paint was a popular trade item, often used by tribes in body adornment. Unfortunately for native peoples, it often had a lead base, further contributing to health problems incurred from their contact with Euroamerican colonists.

[12].William Byrd, The Prose Works of William Byrd of Westover: Narratives of a Colonial Virginian, Edited by Louis B. Wright. (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1966), 308.

[13].Gary B. Nash. Red, White and Black: The Peoples of Early North America. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1992), 131.

[14].Rothrock, "Carolina Traders," : 13-16.

[15].Ibid., : 15-16.

[16].Ibid., : 9.

[17].Ibid., : 10.

[18].Axtell, The European and the Indian, 255.

[19].Ludovic Grant to Governor Glen, 3 May 1752, Indian Book 1: 263.

[20].James Adair, Adair's History of the American Indians, Edited by Samuel Cole Williams, (Johnson City, Tennessee: The Wa'auga Press, 1930), 2.

[21].Bernard Romans, A Concise Natural History of East and West Florida, (New Orleans: Pelican Publishing Company, 1961), 40-41.

[22].Wilbur R. Jacobs, "Unsavory Sidelights On The Colonial Fur Trade," In Indians and Europeans: Selected Articles on Indian-White Relations in Colonial North America, ed. Charles P. Hoffer, (New York: Gailland Publishing, Inc., 1988), : 136.

[23].Rothrock, "Carolina Traders," : 10.

[24].Crane, The Southern Frontier, 115.

[25].Ibid., 137.

[26].Gary B. Nash notes that Carolina merchants made alliances with coastal Indian tribes and convinced them to hunt other tribes for slaves in exchange for European goods. Once brought to Charleston, Nash notes the enslaved Indians began a "Middle Passage" of sorts, ultimately bound for the West Indies, New York and New England. See Nash, Red, White and Black, 132-133.

[27].Rothrock, "Carolina Traders," : 6. There were nine Indian commissioners who were usually also Assembly members. A few notables were Ralph Izard, Richard Berresford, Samuel Eveleigh and Captain John Musgrove. A trade license cost £8 and the bond pledging obedience to the agents and commissioners was £100. See Crane, The Southern Frontier, 150-153. South Carolina and Virginia were both pioneers in the field of Anglo-Indian management. In 1714, Virginia investors organized the **Virginia Indian Company**, a private monopoly whose board of directors fixed trade rates and hired appropriate personnel.

See James H. Merrell. The Indians' New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors from European Contact through the Era of Removal. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 80-81.

[28].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 2 August 1711, Indian Book 1: 13.Unfortunately, the names of backcountry traders and often Indians are not fully recorded in colonial records, despite their

[29].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 15 August 1711, Ibid., : 17.
Verner Crane notes that an Indian slave around 1712 sold for £18-20. See Crane, The Southern Frontier, 113. For more information on Indian slavery, see Theda Perdue's Slavery And The Evolution Of Cherokee Society 1540-1866, Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1979. Tomtatly was located at the modern site of Tomatola in Cherokee County, North Carolina.

[30].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 13 September 1711, Ibid., : 18.

[31].Jacobs, "Unsavory Sidelights," : 138. For more information about American Indians and alcoholism see Peter H. Wolff's "Vasomotor Sensitivity to Alcohol in Diverse Mongoloid Populations," American Journal of Human Genetics, 25 (1973): 193-199.

[32].Axtell, The European and the Indian, 259.

[33].Rothrock, "Carolina Traders," : 13.

[34].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 19 August 1713, Indian Book 1: 49-50. While the Yamassees were located adjacent to Charles Town, the Savannah Indians resided on the east bank of the Savannah River, six miles below modern Augusta, Georgia. See Crane, The Southern Frontier, 133, ftnt. 1.

[35].Indian Book 1: viii-ix. Thomas Nairne first appeared in South Carolina in 1695, as an immigrant from Scotland. He quickly established himself as a military figure, beginning in 1702 when he led Indian and Euramerican troops on a raid against St. Augustine both for military reasons and to procure slaves from among the Spanish Indians. See Alexander Moore, ed., Nairne's Muskhogean Journals: The 1708 Expedition to the Mississippi River, (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1988), 7-9.

[36].Crane, The Southern Frontier, 150.

[37].Brown, "Early Indian Trade,": 121.

[38].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 21 March 1711/1712, Indian Book 1:20.

[39].Ibid., 13.

[40].Indian Book 1: viii-ix.

[41].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 31 August 1714, Ibid., : 59.

[42].Axtell, The European and the Indian, 260-61, Nash, Red, White and Black, 241.

[43].Axtell, The European and the Indian, 262.

[44].Nash, Red, White and Black, 242.

[45].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 17 April 1712, Ibid., : 23.

[46].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 17 May 1712, Ibid., : 25. For a thorough discussion of Indian slavery among one tribe,the Cherokee, see Theda Perdue, Slavery And The Evolution of Cherokee Society 1540-1866, (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1979).

[47].Rothrock, "Carolina Traders," : 14.

[48].Brown, "The Indian Trade,": 121.

[49].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 12 April 1715, Ibid., : 65.

[50].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 24 November 1714, Ibid., : 63.

[51].Axtell, The European and the Indian, 264-65.

[52].Brown, "The Indian Trade,": 121.

[53].Alexander Moore, ed., Nairne's Muskhogean Journals: The 1708 Expedition to the Mississippi River, (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1988), 20. For more on Florida Indians, see Jerald T. Milanich's Florida Indians and the Invasion from Europe, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1995.

[54].Rothrock, "Carolina Traders," : 6-7. Economic motives influenced the regulatory effort, undoubtedly. The trade in white-tail deer skins fell to approximately 18,000 skins annually or 1/3 the pre-war levels from 1715-1720.See Brown, "The Indian Trade,": 122.

[55].Crane, The Southern Frontier, 193-194. The new system used five Indian Commissioners and some of the first men to serve included Colonel George Logan, Ralph Izard, Major John Fenwick, George Chicken, Jonathan Drake and Francis Yonge. Individual salaries were £150 per year.

[56].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 24 July 1716, Indian Book 1: 85-86. In many diplomatic respects, South Carolina's factors were forerunners to the Indian commissaries, such as Alexander Cameron and David Taitt, later employed by Indian Superintendent for the Southern District, John Stuart.

[57].Rothrock, "Carolina Traders," : 11-12.

[58].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 24 July 1716, Indian Book 1: 85-87. The term "factory" used by British colonials meant trade outpost, not a mechanized production facility.

[59].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 14 July 1716, Ibid., : 79.

[60].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 24 July 1716, Ibid., : 88.

[61].Samuel Cole Williams, ed., Early Travels in the Tennessee Country 1540-1800, (Johnson City, Tennessee: The Watauga Press, 1928), 123, f.n. 5. For more on the mission of Colonel George Chicken, see Newton G. Mereness. Travels in the American Colonies.(New York: Antiquarian Press, Ltd., 1961), 95-172.

[62].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 24 July 1716, Indian Book 1: 88-89.

[63].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 1 October 1716, Ibid., : 114.

[64].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 30 January 1716/1717, Ibid., : 155.

[65].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 1 November 1716, Ibid., : 120. Strouds were large, fairly coarse blankets commonly used in the Indian trade.

[66].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 7 November 1716, Ibid., : 123.

[67].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 1 May 1717, Ibid., : 176.

[68].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 9 May 1717, Ibid., : 177-178.

[69].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 20 September 1717, Ibid., : 211-212. The Virginia Trade was a private, not a public entity as in Carolina. See Crane, The Southern Frontier, 198.

[70].Nash, Red, White and Black, 243.

[71].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 8 May 1718, Ibid., : 272.

[72].Board of Commissioners Meeting, 14 June 1718, Ibid., : 291.

[73].Lyn Hastie Thompson, William Weatherford: His Country and His People, (Bay Minette, Alabama: Lavender Publishing Company, 1991), 9.

[74].Affidavit of David Dowey, 25 May 1771, The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indians Affairs: May 21, 1750--August 7, 1754, ed. by Willliam L. McDowell, : 57-58. Hereafter referred to as Indian Book 2 (out of 3).

[75].Crane, The Southern Frontier, 198-199. The South Carolina Indian management system continued to change. In 1723, the powers of the Indian Commissioners were transferred to the governor and three members of his council. In 1724, another legislative change remanded Indian policy control over to both houses of the South Carolina legislature with only one Indian commissioner serving. In general, this version of Public Indian Trade Management functioned until the British Government imposed supracolonial control in 1756. See Crane, The Southern Frontier, 200-201.

[76].Great Britain Public Records Office, Kew, Governor Glen to the Board of Trade, 23 December 1749, CO5/372: 168. Source hereafter referred to as CO5 material.

[77].Affidavit of James Maxwell, 12 June 1751, Indian Book 2: 68-69.

[78].Cornelius Dougherty to Governor Glen, 31 July 1751, Ibid., : 115.

[79].Memorial of Robert Bunning and Others, 22 November 1751, Ibid., : 148-150.

[80].Richard Alden, "The Albany Congress and the Creation of the Indian Superintendencies," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 27 (September 1940) : 193-195.

[81].Ibid., : 196-200.

[82].Ibid.

[83].Alden, "The Albany Congress," : 200-201.

[84].Ibid., : 208. For the complete story on the famous Indian Superintendent, see J. Russell Snapp's John Stuart and the Struggle for Empire on the Southern Frontier, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996).

[85].Crane, The Southern Frontier, 203.

"Radical Journalists, Generalist Intellectuals and Good Neighbors: Alternative Intellectuals and United States-Latin American Relations"

Until the 1960s the tendency in the histories of United States-Latin American relations written by United States historians was to dismiss or stereotype the multifaceted roles of Latin Americans. There were some non-mainstream scholars and intellectuals who addressed the issues of United States-Latin American relations more fully, with a sympathetic appreciation of Latin America, however their ideas were rarely incorporated by mainstream scholars, and for the most part their works have slipped from our historical memory.

Between 1910 and 1970, Carleton Beals, (1897-1979), Herschel Brickell (1889-1952), Samuel Guy Inman (1877-1965), Waldo Frank (1889-1967), and Frank Tannenbaum (1893-1969) sought to balance the literature and the scholarship on United States-Latin American relations. The works of these non-mainstream or alternative intellectuals contribute considerably to the literature of twentieth-century U.S.-Latin American relations, as well as make our historiography and general understanding of this subject more complete and less one-sided.[1]

Beals, Brickell, Inman, Frank, and Tannenbaum stand out in their efforts to portray the realities of Latin America to North American readers. Carleton Beals came to the study of Latin America through journalism, but became one of the most prolific activist-scholars of United States-Latin American relations. Herschel Brickell, a book reviewer and literary critic, and Waldo Frank, a popular writer and intellectual, represent literary figures who wrote books about United States-Latin American relations and about Latin American culture and history. Brickell reviewed Latin American literature so that for the first time in the twentieth century significant numbers of North Americans could be exposed to Latin American books. Brickell and Frank turned their attention to the literary scene in Spain and Latin America during the 1920s, when most North American writers were looking to France for inspiration. Samuel Guy Inman became interested in Latin America through Protestant missionary work, which he pulled back from to spend his life lecturing and writing about Pan-Americanism and the importance of better hemispheric relations. Frank Tannenbaum, the unorthodox Columbia University history professor, regularly crossed disciplinary boundaries, and although he loved Columbia University above all things, preferred to call himself a generalist and created the interdisciplinary Columbia University Seminars because he detested the division of knowledge into disciplines. All five intellectuals wrote about Latin American civilizations when most North Americans scarcely acknowledged that there were civilizations in Latin America. In The Nation Beals noted that "we are more accustomed to paying more attention to a dog fight in Yugoslavia than to a first class revolution in Latin America.[2]

Throughout much of the twentieth century, and especially in the early-and mid-twentieth century, historians depicted Latin America as a passive recipient or victim of United States diplomacy and intervention and generally assigned second-class status to Latin American politics, economics, and culture. The works of the alternative intellectuals are an important component of the literature of twentieth-century U.S.-Latin American relations, however most of the alternative intellectuals have been relegated to general obscurity because they were educated generalists, with no formal graduate training in history, political science, or international affairs.[3]

Carleton Beals, Herschel Brickell, Waldo Frank, Samuel Guy Inman, and Frank Tannenbaum believed in the possibility and desirability of bridging the distance between American ideals and American practices in inter-hemispheric relations. They were Americanists in the broadest sense, and

they struggled to narrow the cultural and intellectual gaps between the United States and Latin America. In the several hundred books and articles which this group wrote, they advocated fair treatment and justice for Latin America, and fought against U.S. imperialism as well as The United Fruit Company, U.S. intervention in Mexico, Cuba, Haiti, and Nicaragua, as well as the Cold War.[4] The five alternative intellectuals absorbed themselves in searching for a new meaning of America that would encompass Latin America. Carleton Beals best expressed this hope for a "New America": "Let both worlds, both expressions of human destiny, our own and that of Latin America's shine out, undefiled, to make a joint future... The new world may then become an ampler experiment in human achievement than history has yet witnessed."[5] In 1934, after serving time in a Cuban prison, and after one of many run-ins with the F.B.I., Beals professed, "... when I defended Mexico against invasion, economic and cultural, I and my little band were defending our America, the America of Whitman and Thoreau. We, I said, were as hated or ignored in our own land-- more inwardly exposed to the menace of business than the peasants of Tampico to the Yankee Kingdoms of oil."[6]

The alternative intellectuals were successful generalists and public intellectuals who published often in the major mainstream and non-mainstream periodicals and journals from the 1920s until the 1940s, without much competition from specialists and scholars. In fact, specialists and scholars often deferred to them. Samuel Guy Inman was a respected instructor at Columbia University before Frank Tannenbaum joined the faculty in 1935, and was regarded by the president of the university, Nicholas Murray Butler, as one of the nation's best experts on Latin America.

The group came of age in the 1930s when they published most widely in periodicals such as The Nation, The New Republic, the New York Post, and Current History. Their books were published by such houses as Robert McBride and Company, J.B. Lippincott, Farrar and Rinehart, Alfred A. Knopf, and B.W. Huebsch. All of them spoke at universities throughout the United States and Latin America. Because they voiced their concerns for the downtrodden and the socially and politically alienated, they often identified and collaborated with other leftist intellectuals and leftist organizations in the United States, Latin America, and elsewhere. But because they rejected any rigorous ideologies they remained isolated and unorganized, on the periphery of most groups. Inman could not accept the goals of the Protestant Missionary Board, Brickell could not accept many of the policies of the State Department, Beals slowly detached himself from the bohemian exiles in Mexico and later the Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky, and Frank resigned from the editorial board of the New Masses when he detected that the periodical had traded criticism for uncritical Marxism, and although Frank Tannenbaum loved Columbia University, the myopic views of many of his colleagues drove him to create the University Seminars which became an institution based on Tannenbaum's beliefs in interdisciplinary, experiential, and non-hierarchical scholarship.

During the "Good Neighbor" spirit of the 1930s, U.S. academic interest in Latin America increased. The demand grew substantially for courses in Latin American studies and for Spanish and Portuguese language courses. The paramount United States effort to increase interest in Latin America came in 1936 when the State Department sent scholars to Latin America to assess ways to increase contacts between the United States and Latin America. Also by the 1930s, private and governmental agencies began to cooperate in promoting inter-American affairs and driving the perceived totalitarian menace from the hemisphere. The Pan-American Union, largely ignored by United States administrations since the turn of the century, gained a larger role in attaining the United States government's objectives. In the spring of 1938, hemispheric intellectual leaders held a meeting designed to promote Pan-American cultural cooperation. While these private sector activities increased, the State Department began to consider its own role in cultural diplomacy.[7]

Against this backdrop the State Department finally created the Division of Cultural Relations in 1938. The specific motivations for creating the division were unclear, however, and its equally unclear mission would hamper the division until it was phased out in the 1950s. Secretary of State Cordell Hull praised it as a tool of propaganda; Assistant Secretary of State Sumner Welles (who first chaired the Division of Cultural Relations), and Laurence Duggan, chief of the Division of Latin American Affairs, identified its function as a new beginning of inter-American cooperation. The United States Congress doubted its worth from the beginning and exhibited its sentiment by allocating only $25,000.00 to the Division for the entire first year.[8]

The creation of the Division of Cultural Relations coincided with the height of the alternative intellectuals' publishing careers. The division provided speaking and traveling opportunities for them in Latin America, and although only Herschel Brickell was directly employed by the State Department as a cultural attache in Colombia, the rest were called on by government agencies for service and to speak in Latin America on behalf of the United States. Even though the government's "Good Neighbor" interest in Latin America made the alternative intellectuals prosperous, their relationships with the government remained ambivalent; all but Brickell had been investigated by the United States Department of State, by Military Intelligence, and by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on numerous occasions. The investigations failed to turn up much except that the alternative intellectuals challenged mainstream (imperialist) United States policies in Latin America. Only Frank temporarily endorsed communism and Marxism in the 1930s, but even he refused to tolerate close relationships with Marxists for long.

Carleton Beals was the most critical of President Franklin Roosevelt and what Beals called the "Good Neighbor Racket."[9] He strongly believed that the Good Neighbor Policy was a battleground between United States Protestant missionaries and the Roman Catholic Church in Latin America. In an unpublished article, Beals anticipated New Left scholarship by thirty years and professed his distrust for Pan-Americanism as a ploy of the United States to perpetuate an unequal relationship with Latin America.[10] Carleton Beals benefitted greatly from the new American interest in Latin America as a result of World War II in Europe and the fear of Axis penetration in Latin America. His major work of these years was The Coming Struggle for Latin America (1938), which was devoured by a popular audience in the United States.[11] The Time magazine book review of The Coming Struggle lauded Beals as "the best informed ... living writer on Latin America."[12]

Clearly by the end of the 1930s, the United States was moving away from the Good Neighbor Policy. Subsequently, it became clear that the Division of Cultural Relations was little more than a panicky response to Nazi influence in Latin America. By the end of World War II the State Department reduced inter-American cultural affairs to the periphery of United States policy as the United States committed itself to the global goal of "spreading democracy" and containing communism. Until the crisis in Guatemala in the early 1950s, Latin America no longer seemed to be threatened. With the fear of German and Italian infiltration removed, Pan-American cultural relations were no longer deemed important.

The 1940s and 1950s were difficult decades for the alternative intellectuals. By 1945 all of the group doubted the effectiveness and underlying motivation of the United States government's efforts in building hemispheric solidarity. Also, newspapers, journals, and publishers began to solicit their work less frequently. The alternative intellectuals reached the height of their careers during an era when public intellectuals-- by definition, a writer, informed by a strong moral impulse, who addressed a general, educated audience in accessible language about the most important issues of the day-- rather than college professors with Ph.D.s educated general audiences about a myriad of "scholarly" topics. That the era of the public, or "socially connected" intellectual began to wane by mid-century and facilitated the decline of the careers of the alternative intellectuals is one reason for their disappearance into relative obscurity. By

the 1950s specialists in Latin American studies had replaced the alternative intellectuals as "experts" on Latin America, a term which was used to describe all of the alternative intellectuals between the 1920s and the 1940s. By the 1960s the generalist intellectual had been replaced by the specialist. The cultural historian Edward Said views the history of the twentieth century as a progressive withdrawal from general questions and responsibility and increasing collusion with a system that divides knowledge into specialisms to prevent any radical or effective engagement with general issues.[13] Moreover, what the alternative intellectuals had to say about Latin America was no longer of such compelling interest to the mainstream and non-mainstream press. The group bitterly opposed the Cold War, McCarthyism, and the United States response to Third World nationalism.

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, during the first few years of the Cuban Revolution, the alternative intellectuals, with the exception of Herschel Brickell, temporarily recovered their readership. They had predicted such a revolution as early as the 1930s, and saw in Cuba hope for sovereignty for Latin America. Beals, Inman, Frank, and Tannenbaum all wrote about the Cuban Revolution and visited Cuba between 1959 and 1960. Each supported the revolution, although Beals, Frank, and Tannenbaum had reservations about Fidel Castro and his tendency toward dictatorship.

United States-Latin American relations between 1910 and 1960 were defined by major revolutions at the beginning and at the end, enveloping the Good Neighbor Policy and the early stages of the Cold War in between. The alternative intellectuals began writing about Latin America during the Mexican Revolution and it is fitting that four of the five ended their careers writing about the Cuban Revolution and its significance for Latin America.

Like many Latin American pensadores, the five intellectuals also shared a love of Walt Whitman, Henry David Thoreau, and Miguel De Cervantes. In these three writers they saw inspiration for the rebirth of a more enlightened America. All in some ways were "Don Quixotes," and most of them identified with the Quixote-like quest for a more ideal society based on humanitarianism, equality, and justice. The alternative intellectuals sought hope for America, which many of their contemporaries such as bohemian exiles, communists, and weary Progressives had long given up. They all ascribed to a hemispheric idea of America, although they differed about what exactly that meant. Above all, they wanted hemispheric cooperation based on a more balanced relationship between the United States and Latin America.

Scholars of United States and Latin American history can learn much from the works of the alternative intellectuals. They were writing perceptive historical works about United States-Latin American relations in the early and mid-twentieth century when most historians merely echoed the myths and stereotypes of Latin American inferiority. They also used the prism of culture to understand Latin American history at a time when most historians focused mainly on politics and economics. For the most part, the alternative intellectuals have been relegated to obscurity. The over-specialization of academic disciplines and the demise of the generalist intellectual in America have kept their works out of the historiography of United States-Latin American relations. The works and ideas of the alternative intellectuals comprise an important component in the history of United States-Latin American relations. Theirs were active voices which transcended several generations of scholarship in the twentieth century.

ENDNOTES

[1]. I have labeled this group of intellectuals as "alternative intellectuals" because they do not fit into any other contemporary group of intellectuals in the United States, namely because of their life-long commitments to

understand and write about the realities of Latin America for the reading public in the United States. The alternative intellectuals did share many similarities with other critical intellectuals of the early to mid-twentieth century, and they were products of the rise of the public intellectual in America in the early twentieth century, as well as the rise of modern literary radicalism.

[2]. The Nation (May 1, 1925),6.

[3]. Frank Tannenbaum is an exception in that he did receive his Ph.D. in history in 1927, however he came to academia through unconventional means and he considered himself a generalist, and wrote as a renegade generalist intellectual with interests that crossed interdisciplinary lines.

[4]. For a complete bibliography of the published works of the alternative intellectuals see: Virginia S. Williams, "Alternative Intellectuals and United States-Latin American Relations, 1910-1970" (Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1993), 216-223. Other works on the general topic are: John A. Britton, Carleton Beals: A Radical Journalist in Latin America, Albuquerque, The University of New Mexico Press, 1987, Helen Delpar, "Frank Tannenbaum: The Making of a Mexicanist, 1914-1933", The Americas 45 (October 1988), 153-171, Helen Delpar, The Enormous Vogue of Things Mexican, Tuscaloosa, University of Alabama Press, 1992.

[5]. Carleton Beals, Mexican Maize (Philadelphia and London: J.B. Lippincott, 1931), 361.

[6]. Carleton Beals, Banana Gold (Philadelphia and London: J.B. Lippincott, 1934), 296.

[7]. J. Manuel Espinosa, Inter-American Beginnings of U.S. Cultural Diplomacy, 1936-1948 (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, 1976), 111.

[8]. Irwin F. Gellman, Good Neighbor Diplomacy: United States Policies in Latin America, 1933-1945 (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), 144.

[9]. Carleton Beals, "Taking Stock of the Good Neighbor Policy", Carleton Beals Collection, Special Collections, Mugar Memorial Library, Boston University, Box 178, no date.

[10]. Carleton Beals, What Style Pan-Americanism?" unpublished article, no date, Carleton Beals Collection, Box 79, folder 1.

[11]. Carleton Beals, The Coming Struggle for Latin America (Philadelphia and New York: Lippincott, 1937).

[12]. Time, 31 (April 25, 1938), 70.

[13]. Edward W. Said, Culture and Imperialism,(Vintage Books, New York, 1993).

Why Didn't We See It Coming? Predicting the Soviet Future: An Exercise in Futility

The breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991 caught virtually everyone by surprise, the public, the media, statesmen, the intelligence community, and even most academic experts. As the renowned scholar on Russia, Martin Malia, noted in his post mortem of the Soviet system, "it would be too much to expect that anyone should have predicted the precise form of the crash of 1989-1991; and of course, no one did."[1] He wondered, though, "How could so many have been so wrong about so much for so long?" And I must confess, I was caught right there with the "so many."[2]

What accounts for this almost universal inability to foresee the collapse of the Soviet Union? I had intended to investigate this mystery by searching samples of literature on the Soviet experience for some clues, in particular predictions about the Soviet future. As I began examining some 200 books on the Soviet experience, from the 1920s to the present, I was amazed to find how prevalent the practice of predicting the future had become in the field of Soviet studies. Scholars, including historians, were just as willing to look to the Soviet future as to the past and present. I therefore shifted focus from explaining the inability to foresee the coming collapse to examining representative samples of predictions from the past and testing their validity. I would match past predictions with eventual outcomes, paying particular attention to those predicting the ultimate outcome, the breakup of the Soviet Union.

Although some of the earlier experts in the field of Soviet studies, such as Merle Fainsod, cautioned that "the prediction of future developments remains a notoriously hazardous enterprise,"[3] and another, Leonard Schapiro, reminded us that "prediction, which is neither profitable nor easy, is not a function of the historian,"[4] the literature teemed with predictions. Seweryn Bialer, a more recent practitioner, observed shrewdly that "one sometimes has the impression--and it is only a slight exaggeration--that Western sovietologists speak more about the Soviet future than about the present."[5]

This obsession with the future owes much to Karl Marx. He claimed that by identifying and understanding certain socio-economic forces, one could explain not only the past and the present, but could also chart the course of future developments. With scientific certainty, Marx predicted the inevitable overthrow of capitalism and the subsequent construction of a socialist utopia. Robert V. Daniels credits Marx with starting the practice of predictions when he explains, "the doctrine is a picture of history, past, present, and future, which gives the present movement that definite place which was forecast by the original author of the picture a century ago."[6]

As Russian revolutionaries adapted Marxism to suit their own purposes and Russian conditions, they too claimed the power to look into the future and proclaimed the inevitable victory of their Soviet experiment. Subsequently many observers, both friends and foes, accepted the practice of speculating about the future as a legitimate, natural step in their effort to understand the Soviet system--no less valid than examining its past and present. In the West, comparing real Soviet accomplishments and conditions with the course set by the Kremlin became a measure of whether or not the Soviet system was succeeding.

In the 1920s and 1930s, the earliest period of the Soviet experiment, there was relatively little interest in the Soviet system because it was not yet clear whether and for how long it would last. It was not until the Soviet Union and the United States entered World War II as allies that American interest in the Soviet Union and its future was whetted. By the end of the war it was obvious that the Soviet Union was here to stay, and as the wartime alliance deteriorated into a cold war rivalry, interest in Soviet studies increased. As this rivalry assumed global importance, and as many in the West came to believe that the fate of civilization as they knew it hinged on the outcome, more and more observers tried to predict that outcome. In a reprint of his classic pre-war study of the Russian Revolution, William Chamberlain

observed that "in 1935 it didn't appear that communism would go very far, but now seventeen years later it seems that Russian communism deserves the understanding of careful study and analysis."[7] So began an intensive scrutiny of the Soviet Union and its system, and with it came even more predictions. Hugh Seton-Watson, a leading academic expert on Imperial Russia, compared the Soviet system with the Imperial system and concluded that the Soviet Union, like Imperial Russia, "is outwardly impressive. . . But like cast iron, though heavy it is also brittle. A strong blow can shatter it to pieces."[8] Harry Schwartz, a scholar of the Soviet economy, writing in 1950, regarded "Soviet goals as difficult if not impossible to achieve," and added that "it would not be surprising if the dream of communism in this century proves to be hollow ."[9]

With Stalin's death in 1953 crystal ball-gazing entered a new phase. With few exceptions most observers accepted that the Soviet Union, having become a superpower under Stalin, would remain a permanent fixture on the international scene. Indeed, some scholars feared that not only was it here to stay, but it might even succeed in overtaking the West. In 1961 Harry Schwartz wrote that wherever one turned, there was evidence of Soviet strength.[10] "Defeat for the United States in the world struggle is not yet a foregone conclusion. But in 1961 such defeat is far more threatening than could have been foreseen in 1945."[11]

Alongside the general consensus that the post-Stalin Soviet system was permanent --at least for the foreseeable future--two somewhat different views began to emerge regarding the more distant Soviet future. One envisioned a collapse, the other a "convergence" between the Soviet system and "ours." A few critics already perceived weaknesses in the Soviet system and argued that unless things changed, the system was doomed to eventual failure and collapse. Others, more sympathetic to the Soviets, prophesied that their system, either according to policies or as a result of circumstances, would evolve into something more like the Western democratic-capitalist system. Both approaches benefited from the growing popularity of the social sciences in American universities and confidently extrapolated present social, economic, and political trends into the future, drawing conclusions compatible with their hypotheses. Skeptics such as Hugh Seton-Watson, however, questioned these new certainties: "Indeed, no sooner are prophesies fulfilled, than they turn out to have been false. Yet the belief that social and political prophesies can be or have been replaced by an exact science of human society and human history, is only another in a long line of human myths, . . ."[12]

Another factor that altered the conditions of Soviet watching was the so-called "Khrushchev thaw," which opened up the Soviet system to greater outside scrutiny, thereby revealing even more flaws in the Soviet monolith. Many experts turned their attention and predictions away from the fate of the system as a whole to certain problem areas, such as the nationality issue. Adam Ulam, perhaps the most prolific of all scholars on the Soviet experience, suggested that "a threat of national separation within the Soviet Union would be viewed by the leaders as a matter of life and death."[13] Another potential problem area was Eastern Europe. Although early in his tenure Khrushchev demonstrated that the Soviet hold over the states of Eastern Europe would remain firm, Ulam predicted that these states would soon enough become "troublesome dependents, ungrateful, demanding, always in need of being watched."[14] He also perceived in the Kremlin a relaxation of Marxism-Leninsim and recognized in this trend a gradual erosion of the legitimacy of the system, as well as a distant threat to its survival.[15] Ulam already predicted "that the Soviet Union, in its professed attempt to catch up with and overcome the West in material culture, will discover that in the process it has left Marxism behind.[16] Others, such as Joseph Novak in *The Future Is Ours, Comrade*, hoped that the title of his book did not come to pass.[17]

The problem area that came under the most scrutiny was the economy. Khrushchev had boasted how the Soviets would surpass the West in economic development. Harry Schwartz , for one, warned that Khruschev's boasts should not be dismissed lightly and that they might even come to pass. A critic of the

convergence theory, Schwartz thought it naive to speculate that a more rational Soviet economy would someday lead to capitalism. To the contrary, rationalization would only strengthen socialism and the Soviet system. He predicted, "provided the Soviet Union can avoid a major war and internal unrest over the next decade, its rapid advance in material power is as certain as anything can be in this uncertain world."[18] Another economic historian, Alec Nove, conceded the possibility that the Soviet economy might eventually overtake that of the United States, but to make it work, radical restructuring would be required, and the opposition of vested interests would have to be overcome--exactly Gorbachev's dilemma in the 1980s.[19]

With Khrushchev's 1964 ouster and the beginning of the reactionary Brezhnev era, hopes for gradual, democratizing change faded. Proponents of the convergence theory resigned themselves to the prospect that further advances in this direction were not forthcoming. As for the advocates of the inevitable collapse, they had to push the apocalypse farther into the more distant future. With the aging Brezhnev in power the issue of a generation change became crucial. Predicting the Soviet future became less a matter of comparing the relative virtues of the two competing systems or of examining specific problem areas than a study of actuary charts and life span probabilities.

Guarded optimism turned to disappointment, especially among those who had hoped for a liberalization of the system. An anonymous "Observer" lamented that he had heard "the argument that the current repression is the beginning of the dictatorship's death throes: that the old guard is losing its grip . . . I have heard this hypothesis . . . in the West, but never in Russia . . . Whatever the dictatorship's prospects in the long run, there is little hope in Moscow for its demise in the coming decades."[20] Allen Kassoff, the editor of a collection of futuristic articles, *Prospects for Soviet Society*, agreed, suggesting that in all likelihood the Soviet leadership would survive. He conjectured, "The current process of reform and adjustment is likely to prevent any real collision that would bring the system down."[21] In the same book the distinguished cultural historian of Russia, James Billington, was not as certain of the system's staying power. He speculated that "remarkable changes may well be in store, and could come with unpredictable suddenness that is so characteristic of Russian history and is invariably later seen to have been predictable." [22]

At the outset of the Brezhnev era Soviet superpower status was unquestioned, although some disagreed over the scope of Soviet strength and intentions. By the mid-1970s, with detente entrenched as the Kremlin's global policy, tensions eased somewhat. The Soviet Union did not look quite as threatening as before, and most experts dismissed chances of a superpower conflict as remote. But in the boldest prediction of all, Andrej Amalrik, in his 1970 book, *Will the Soviet Union Survive Until_1984?*, sketched a future scenario of not only a major war, but also of the consequent collapse of the Soviet Union. The conflict would not, however, engage the Soviet Union with the United States, but rather with China, sometime in the late 1970s. This war would exacerbate tensions within the Soviet system, and by the early 1980s would precipitate the disintegration of the Soviet Empire.[23]

Amalrik's basic premise proved wrong, of course. A war between China and the Soviet Union did not occur. But some of his other predictions were on target. The Soviet Union did disintegrate—although not before 1984. He also envisioned the reunification of Germany, which, he asserted, would coincide with a process of de-Sovietization sweeping across Eastern Europe.[24]

The nationality issue remained a topic for speculation. In 1971 Edward Allworth, a specialist on the nationality problem, hesitated to make an outright prediction, but suggested that this issue could possibly determine the fate of the Soviet Union.[25] Writing nearly ten years later, Seweryn Bialer observed that "this issue . . . is potentially the most devastating for the state in its possible long-range consequences and presents the deepest challenge to the legitimacy of the regime."[26] The most influential crystal ball, in terms of reaching the general public, belonged to the journalist, Hedrick Smith, whose 1976 best-selling

The Russians probably reached more Americans than did any of the academic works. In it he minimized the short-term effects of the nationality problem and did not expect it to lead to the break-up of the Soviet Union. Smith hedged his bet with the caveat that "it is a very long-term prospect . . . I saw no evidence of a secessionist trend powerful enough to challenge Soviet authorities.[27]

The most critical problem area remained the economy. Even former optimists had to concede that if allowed to continue along its present course, the Soviet economy could shortly face a crisis. In the late 1960s Alec Nove noted that "we are seeing only the first step of a big change, which may eventually lead the Soviet . . . system towards what might be called market socialism."[28] Perhaps uncomfortable with his overly bold look into the future, Nove explained, "Fortunately, this is a history, not an exercise in crystal-gazing."[29] Toward the end of the Brezhnev era many were indeed expecting change, although there was disagreement on the nature and extent of change. Hedrick Smith expected the Russians to "weather the storm" and was certain the "Soviet economic system has considerable resiliency and durability."[30] Seweryn Bialer, however, forecast a bleak economic future, but economic problems aside, the system as a whole could still summon considerable "reserves of stability. . .Time [was] NOT running out on the Soviet system."[31]

Throughout Russian and Soviet history the death of a ruler raised great expectations about the successor. Never was this truer than when Brezhnev died in 1982. The long awaited generation change in the Soviet leadership was beginning. Along with the expectations came speculation about a new leader and the future direction of the state. What was most striking in the literature of the day was the universal failure to see the final collapse coming, which, at the time, was less than a decade away.

As we look back on this transitional period, it seems that as events were nearing a climax, the crystal balls, which had viewed the future so clearly in earlier years, were becoming cloudier by the minute. One crystal, however, was more polished than others. In discussing possible successors to Brezhnev, Archie Brown, mentioned several, but then added that "the one whom no Western observer thus far seems to have suggested as Brezhnev's immediate successor is Mikhail Gorbachev. . . . Yet he is in a number of respects the most obvious choice.[32]

Yuri Andropov, however, was the first successor. Although hope for reform abounded, nothing much changed during his brief rule, which ended with his death in February 1984. His successor, Konstantin Chernenko, did not last much longer. With the passing of Andropov and then of Chernenko, the succession attracted even greater attention. So did the problems and pressures building up within this apparently rudderless Soviet system. But even at that late hour most speculation stopped short of predicting the imminent breakdown of the system. Indeed, several works on the Soviet military, strategy, and foreign policy, still projected images of stability and continuity, strength rather than weakness.[33]

Images of strength and continuity also remained the norm in regards to the Soviet grip on Eastern Europe. Only six years before revolutions swept the region, Andrzej Korbonski, whose views seem to represent many others at the time, declared that "in the eyes of the Kremlin, Eastern Europe is a highly valuable asset whose future status is simply non-negotiable."[34] In the short run, noted Korbonski, Soviet policy would be assertive and "the Soviet Union will retain its hold on Eastern Europe, regardless of its mounting cost."[35]

It became obvious, however, that the nationality-ethnic problem was intensifying and could no longer be ignored. Robert Daniels saw it as the Soviet Union's most serious internal problem and cautioned that "given all these centrifugal tensions, political liberation might allow minority separation to disrupt the Soviet state, as it already threatens to do so in Yugoslavia." In the long run he perceived this issue as the one most "threatening to the strength and stability of the state."[36] Gail Lapidus also recognized this matter as critical, but found it "difficult to imagine a scenario, short of a major war, in which 'ethnonationalism' would seriously threaten the stability of the regime."[37]

Most experts continued to credit enough vitality and resilience to the Soviet system, if not to remedy the ills, then at least to suppress their symptoms and preserve the system--more or less in its present form. Robert Byrnes noted that "even with all the critical problems, the nature of the system is such that major changes are unlikely."[38] Gail Lapidus, after discussing every serious social problem affecting the Soviet system, from "social malaise" to "growing pessimism about the Soviet future," found it ". . . difficult to imagine circumstances under which current social trends will become unmanageable or provoke a serious political crisis."[39]

As for the all-important economy, with impending doom around the corner, some experts such as Robert Campbell believed that "discouraging as economic prospects are, they are unlikely to create such overwhelming pressure as to topple the system or threaten its rulers' hold over society. . . . the situation is not beyond repair."[40] Seweryn Bialer thought it most unlikely that the Soviet system was on the verge of disintegration and "in all probability will not in the next decade face a systemic crisis that endangers its existence. . . Gigantic economies such as the Soviet Union's, presided over by intelligent and educated professionals, do not go bankrupt. . . they decline . . . but they do not disintegrate."[41]

As one reads these projections of strength and durability, one wonders why for years so many experts had identified certain problems and conditions as portents of change, even disaster for the Soviet Union. But now that these conditions had reached advanced, crisis stages, when one would expect even greater potency, so many observers dismissed them as not virulent enough to effect significant change. Many prognosticators appeared to back off from the apocalypse they and others had been predicting. Instead they reaffirmed the staying power of the Soviet system. As the prophecies neared fulfillment, faith in them seemed to be wavering.

Then in 1985 Mikhail Gorbachev came. Along with him came unprecedented expectations for reform and his dual policies of *glasnost* and *perestroika*. Initially optimism prevailed. Few if any predictions anticipated the breakdown of the Soviet system. For a while at least, the spirits of those who had been predicting a collapse were at an all-time low. Among the despondent were Mikhail Heller and Aleksandr Nekrich, who in 1986 published a scathing indictment of the Soviet past, including the very recent past, in *Utopia in Power*. They depicted Gorbachev as just another Soviet leader, hardly different from his predecessors. With undaunted sarcasm they declared that "since Gorbachev did not have a fat wife, all the talk about Soviet totalitarianism must be false." [42] Like many critics, Heller and Nekrich attributed so much power to the Soviet system that they blinded themselves to the possibility that the system was weaker than they estimated. In the last line of their book they declared their intentions to keep hopes alive for the system's demise, unaware that their wish would soon come to pass.[43]

Within a few years it became apparent that Gorbachev's policies had unleashed unanticipated forces and opposition. Although speculation about his prospects for success or failure abounded, few if any observers predicted the imminent collapse of the Soviet Union itself. Some, such as Helene Carrere d'Encausse, suggested the possibility, but couched it in conditional terms, not as inevitable.[44] She warned that reform was critically necessary, and if it failed, it "would mean the inevitable end of the system."[45]

Gordon Smith, of the University of South Carolina, writing in 1991 on the eve of the collapse, suggested that "the struggle for change in the USSR has assumed a momentum that now threatens Gorbachev's political career and the very existence of the Soviet Union as we have known it ."[46] He declined, however, to predict Gorbachev's failure and the collapse. Smith expected that "despite problems, Gorbachev's tenure appears reasonably secure. Only a coup d'etat by the military, impeachment, resignation, or death, could shorten his tenure."[47] A coup did follow, but it failed to oust Gorbachev. It did, nonetheless, weaken him and set in motion events that eroded his leadership and precipitated the breakup of the Soviet Union.

With the collapse came the universal surprise. It was time for the autopsy. Along with explanations for the collapse, for Gorbachev's failure, and for our surprise, there were a lot of "I told you so's." I must add that I do not recall running across very many of them in the literature written prior to the event. Adam Ulam confessed that "what no one could have imagined as happening, except in the aftermath of the horrors of a nuclear war or a violent revolution, has come to pass peacefully, and within an amazingly short time."[48] Ulam and others should take consolation in what Peter the Great once said, "Russia is a country in which things that just don't happen, happen."[49]

Yes, even in these obituaries there were predictions for the future. Old habits are hard to break. The journalist David Remnick, in his backdrop to the collapse titled *Lenin's Tomb*, optimistically conjectured that "perhaps one day Russia might even become somehow ordinary, a country of problems rather than catastrophes . . . that would be something to see.[50] Some, including Jonathan Adelman, had learned their lesson and cautioned colleagues that "past predictions about Russia and the Soviet Union have been notoriously wrong, and we should be wary about making any now."[51] But many others could not bear parting with their crystal balls. Mary McAuley asked, "What does the future hold?" Although she admitted that it was "impossible to answer," she proceeded to speculate about the future of democracy and the Russian economy.[52] As Yogi Berra once said, "De ja vu all over again."

And what does the future hold for Russia and the former Soviet Union according to these latest predictions? Thanks, but no thanks. This time around I'll do my own speculating. As I discovered, and as recent events have confirmed, the predictions found in even the most respected scholarly literature on the Soviet system can claim hardly any more validity than speculation about where Elvis might turn up next. Just as the Soviet system had been built on weak foundations, so had the predictions forecasting its fate. I tend to agree with those who admonish historians to stick to the past, not speculate about the future.

ENDNOTES

[1] Martin Malia, *The Soviet Tragedy: History of Socialism in Russia, 1917-1991* (New York: Free Press, 1994), 5.

[2] Malia, 6.

[3] Merle Fainsod, *How Russia Is Ruled* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 577.

[4] Leonard Schapiro, *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (New York: Random House, 1960), 589.

[5] Seweryn Bialer, *Stalin's Successors: Leadership, Stability, and Change in the Soviet Union* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 283.

[6] Robert V. Daniels, *A Documentary History of Communism* (New York: Random House, 1960), xxv.

[7] William Henery Chamberlain, *The Russian Revolution* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1965), I ,v.

[8] Hugh Seton-Watson, *The Decline of Imperial Russia, 1855-1914* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1960), 380.

[9] Harry Schwartz, *Russia's Soviet Economy* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1950), 561.

[10] Harry Schwartz, *The Red Phoenix: Russia Since World War II* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1961), 405.

[11] Schwartz, *Red Phoenix*, 413.

[12] Seton-Watson, *Imperial Russia*, 742.

[13] Adam Ulam, *The Unfinished Revolution: An Essay on the Sources of Influence of Marxism and Communism* (New York: Vintage, 1960), 293.

[14] Ulam, *Unfinished Revolution*, 294.

[15] Ulam, *Unfinished Revolution*, 272.

[16] Ulam, *Unfinished Revolution*, 299.

[17] Joseph Novak, *The Future Is Ours, Comrade* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1964), 10.

[18] Schwartz, *Red Phoenix*, 410-12.

[19] Alec Nove, *An Economic History of the U.S.S.R.* (Harmondsworth, Engl.: Pelican Books, 1972), 311-18.

[20] Observer, *Message From Moscow* (New York: Vintage Books, 1971), 84

[21] Allen Kassoff, ed., *Prospects for Soviet Society* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968), 505.

[22] James H. Billington, "The Intellectuals," in *Prospects for Soviet Society*, 469-70.

[23] Andrej Amalrik, *Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984?* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), 50-64.

[24] Amalrik, 60-61.

[25] Edward Allwarth, ed., *Soviet Nationality Problems* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), 16.

[26] Seweryn Bialer, *Stalin's Successors: Leadership, Stability, and Change in the Soviet Union* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 207.

[27] Hedrick Smith, *The Russians*, rev. ed. (1976; New York: Ballantine Books, 1984), 721-24.

[28] Nove, *An Economic History of the U.S.S.R.*, 371.

[29] Nove, *An Economic History of the U.S.S.R.*, 372.

[30] H. Smith, *The Russians*, 743-45.

[31] Bialer, *Stalin's Successors*, 305.

[32] Archie Brown and Michael Kaiser, eds., *Soviet Policy for the 1980's* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982), 237, 240.

[33] Steven E. Miller, ed., *Conventional Forces and American Defense Policy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986); John Prados, *The Soviet Estimate: U.S. Intelligence Analysis and Soviet Strategic Forces* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986); Lawrence Freedman, *U.S. Intelligence and the Soviet Strategic Threat* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

[34] Andrzej Korbonski, "Eastern Europe," in Robert F. Byrnes, ed., *After Brezhnev: Sources of Soviet Conduct in the 1980s* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983), 297.

[35] Korbonski, 340.

[36] Robert V. Daniels, *Russia: The Roots of Confrontation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985), 316-17.

[37] Gail Lapidus, "Social Trends," in *After Brezhnev*, 233.

[38] Byrnes, *After Brezhnev*, 439-40.

[39] Lapidus, "Social Trends," 233, 245.

[40] Robert W. Campbell, "The Economy," in *After Brezhnev*, 120.

[41] Seweryn Bialer, "The Political System," in *After Brezhnev*, 65.

[42] Mikhail Heller and Aleksandr M. Nekrich, *Utopia in Power: The History of the Soviet Union from 1917 to the Present* (New York: Summit Books, 1986), 728.

[43] Heller and Nekrich, 732.

[44] Helene Carrere d'Encausse, *The Russian Syndrome: One Thousand Years of Political Murder* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1992), 387.

[45] Carrrere d'Encausse, 391

[46] Gordon B. Smith, *Soviet Politics: Struggling With Change* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), v.

[47] Gordon B. Smith, 338-39.

[48] Adam Ulam, *The Communists: The Story of Power and Lost Illusions, 1948-1991* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1992), ix.

[49] Robert G. Kaiser, *Why Gorbachev Happened: His Triumphs, his Failures, and His Fall* (New York: Touchstone, 1992), 13.

[50] David Remnick, *Lenin's Tomb: The Last Days of the Soviet Empire* (New York: Random

Jouse, 1993), xii.

[51] Jonathan Adelman, *Torrents of Spring: Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1995), 6.

[52] Mary McAuley, *Soviet Politics, 1917-1991* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 120.

From the Gay 90's to the Roaring 20's: The Role of Clothing
in the Lives of South Carolina Women, 1890 - 1925

Clothing is one of the most important facets of the way people present themselves to the world. Appropriate apparel is especially required of women, and has been throughout history. Clothing choices send messages not only about one's gender and social status, but also about the basic character of the person wearing them. The decisions South Carolina women made about their dress styles in the decades from the 1890s to the 1920s give essential clues as to how they perceived themselves. The fact that they did not develop a distinctive style, despite the recent sectional history and continued poverty of the region, suggests a desire to belong to the American cultural mainstream.

Across the nation, the period from 1890 to 1925 was an extremely volatile time in the world of fashion, and this development was reflected in South Carolina. Local women's choices of attire are evidenced in the costume collection of the South Carolina State Museum, a significant source of information for this paper. Some of the most dramatic alterations in clothing styles for centuries occurred in the course of these thirty-five years. These changes directly reflected the shifting roles of women in society. No longer confined exclusively to the domestic sphere, women's hard-won social freedoms were reflected in clothing that provided them with greater physical mobility. Garments became simpler, less structured, and skirts gradually were shorter. No longer was a woman dependent upon a maid to help her get dressed. The new ideal was a healthy, athletic woman who could take care of herself. The formation of this new model was shaped by published writings, popular culture and the experiences of the women themselves through participation in clubs, higher education, and the working world. South Carolina women were firmly in the mainstream of this cultural shift. For example, newspapers throughout the state carried the latest news on women's fashions and activities, in addition to articles expressing progressive attitudes towards women's situations. In addition, South Carolina women's diaries discussed the newest styles and opinions. This paper illustrates the direct linkages between how changes in the popular perceptions of women and their roles were shown in their garments, and how even the methods of obtaining clothes and attitudes towards their maintenance transformed markedly in these decades among South Carolinians.

In order to understand how much fashion truly changed, it is necessary to establish what the prevailing styles were in each decade. A fashionable woman of the 1890s in South Carolina or elsewhere could never have foreseen the radical direction costume would take within the next thirty years, for the styles of this period were not significantly different from what had gone before. The long-skirted corseted form had been the standard for centuries, with only minor modifications. Even the Empire style of the early nineteenth century, the biggest exception to the rule, included long skirts and light corseting[1]. The most distinctive stylistic elements of 1890s clothing were sleeves which were full at the shoulder and upper arm, called leg-o-mutton for their resemblance to a leg of lamb, skirts which were fuller in the back and long enough to trail on the ground and the hourglass silhouette which metamorphosed to an S-curve by the end of the century. Corsets of the 1890s achieved the fashionable line by pushing the rib cage forward, with the head tilted back to compensate for balance. Bust and hip pads were available for women lacking in natural attributes.[2] Two lasting style innovations from this decade were the blouse and skirt combination and the ladies' suit. The fronts of blouses and bodices were often pleated to add fullness.[3]

Fashions in South Carolina in the 1890s closely mirrored these guidelines. The early issue of The State newspaper provided up-to-date fashion advice in a weekly column by Olive Harper, who purportedly got her information straight from New York. Rueta Louise Childe also wrote articles on the latest styles and how to make or acquire them. According to Ms. Childe, the colors for spring 1891 were palest yellow, gray, tan and heliotrope.[4] Ms. Harper concurred, but added that one of the prettiest gowns

she saw that season was of myrtle green, with a slight wrinkled drapery across the front. Wrinkled drapery was all the rage in 1891, although it was a difficult effect to achieve. She did give specific instructions for the home dressmaker reading her column as to how the create that drapery.[5]

The extant costumes for the period in the collection of the South Carolina State Museum do closely mirror the fashionable dictates published at the time. Most of them are in pastels or brown, with the puffed sleeves, long pleated skirts with extra materials in the back, fitted and boned bodices, ruffles, ribbons, lace and high necks. The earlier ones leave space for a bustle in the back, but this fashion had declined by the end of the decade.[6] Most of the gowns saved would likely be best gowns of high style, but their lines closely follow national trends.

Fashion trends began to shift after the turn of the century. Not all women wholeheartedly embraced these changes, preferring to keep to the long established and respectable long-skirted, long-sleeved, curvy, corseted looks.[7] These were still prevalent from 1900-1905, and continued to be worn by the more conservative through the end of the decade. For the adventurous woman, however, new possibilities began to open up. One of the first of these was the walking skirt, which was a few inches shorter than the skirts of the previous century, being up off the ground for easier movement. The tips of shoes were sometimes seen, which was a major change. From 1907 onwards the deep S-curved, swaybacked silhouette popular in the early years of the decade became slimmer and straighter and less tightly cinched at the waist. Pastels remained the dominant color throughout the decade, and fashionable women favored soft shimmery fabric. Very feminine blouses continued to be popular, made with long sleeves, high necks and inserted lace panels, all of sheer cotton. Embroidery, ruffles and pleats were still quite common embellishments. These blouses were worn with rather plain, full skirts in combinations of blue and white or black and white.[8]

The sheer blouses so popular in this period would be worn over a wide array of undergarments. A woman began with a chemise, over which went her corset, which was then laced as tightly as possible. Over the corset was worn a corset cover, usually embroidered and embellished with lace and tucks and pleats similar to a blouse. They looked much like modern fitted tank tops. Corsets came in white, black and drab (off-white). The corset covers could often be seen through the blouses, so it was important that they looked nice. Below the waist, a woman wore knickers or pantaloons, underslips and several petticoats of varying materials depending upon the weather. These were usually white or black, and were commonly made of silk, cotton or flannel.[9] Needless to say, it was extremely difficult for a woman to get dressed without help, and it was hard to move freely once she was clothed.

Advertisements for the 1900s in South Carolina newspapers included many mentions of corsets and undergarments for sale. In fact, these were some of the earliest ready-to-wear garments available for purchase. Underwear was an essential part of every woman's wardrobe and it did not take as much tailoring as outerwear.[10] Ready-to-wear clothing was already a growing field by this time. Increasing numbers of department stores were opening in the major South Carolina cities, and their inventories included ever greater quantities of tailored suits, shirtwaists (blouses) and skirts for sale. These advertisements were generally accompanied by drawings of women in the latest styles, plus more text than is usually seen in modern advertisements, extemporizing on the quality of their stock, often imported from the North.[11]

By the end of the 1900s, the seeds of fashion change had been planted. With the slow but increasing growth of the ready-made clothing industry, fashion was no longer solely for the rich. Women of limited means could afford the new styles. To remain fashionably clothed, they probably had to spend no more than approximately $70 annually in local stores, or less if they shopped the mail order catalogs, with special occasion clothing being excluded from that total.[12] Clothing in the 1910s became simpler, using less fabric and decoration. Some older women kept to the fashions they had adopted in their

younger years. The less conservative younger women wore dresses with round or vee necks, natural waists, easier hairstyles and the hobble skirt first came into fashion. They were described by an educated upstate South Carolinian, Georgia Cleveland, in her diary after she had seen a woman wearing one in downtown Spartanburg as "a skirt drawn in above the ankles with a tight band. A very strange and curious fashion."[13] By the end of the decade these skirts were slit in the side or front for easier movement.[14] Styles revealed more of the arms, neck and legs than previously. Corsets were no longer universally required and even when they were worn, they had slid down the body and were equivalent to the modern girdle. Petticoats had completely disappeared. Some attempts were made by designers at the end of the decade to reintroduce more elaborate styles, but women who had adopted the easier fitting new fashions refused to go back to being constricted in the name of beauty.[15] Blouses were still very popular, but unlike the more formal tops of the 1900s they now had a soft, loose, less tailored look. They also had round, vee or crossover necklines, sometimes with a sailor collar in back.[16] Coat suits remained popular, being quite practical.[17] Chemise dresses were also well established by 1919. Even before the war, skirts had become shorter, reaching down to the ankle or even the lower calf, showing the shoes or boots.[18]

World War I did not disrupt the fashion world a great deal, especially in America as our involvement in the conflict was relatively limited. After the war's conclusion however, fashion began to change dramatically. Nevertheless, the short skirts that most people associate with the decade did not appear until the later years of the 1920s. Shorter skirts were widely accepted as even the more conservative women had adopted the lower calf length dress as much more practical without being too risqué by this decade. Dress lengths hovered around the calves in the immediate post-war years, but were only two inches below the knee by 1924, and by 1925 had reached the knee.[19] Waistlines were dropped, with sashes or belting down around the top of the hips, leading to a long straight silhouette. The adolescent figure became the ideal, in sharp contrast to the rounded, mature woman's figure of just thirty-five year earlier.

The clothing of South Carolina women reflected all of the changes, although they were never on the cutting edge. Newspaper advertisements in the Charleston Evening Post for winter and spring of 1924 still show long skirts, reaching down to mid-calf.[20] The seeds of change can be seen however in a contemporary movie advertisement for Flaming Youth in which a stereotypically dressed flapper is dancing the night away in a very short skirt.[21] Dresses from the period in the State Museum's collection were just beginning to reflect the shorter styles, although they were already usually sleeveless or with loose, flowing sleeves and were often heavily beaded and low-waisted.[22]

The fashionable South Carolina woman of the mid-1920s in her knee length, dropped waisted, sleeveless dress with long straight lines looked utterly different than the fashion plate of the 1890s in her long leg-o-mutton sleeves, high necked and tightly boned bodice and long sweeping skirts. Social attitudes towards women had also changed a great deal in the same period, as had women's perceptions of themselves. The social and psychological changes had a direct reflection on the clothing the women chose to wear. Throughout history, the status of women has been reflected in their attire. Tight garments that restrict or hamper her movements are always prevalent at times when the woman's social status is inferior to that of men and she is confined to the home.[23] The range of a woman's physical ability was severely restricted by the corsets, form-fitting clothes and multiple layers of underclothing worn in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As women in South Carolina slowly began to expand their range of activities, their clothes had to change.

Like any other aspect of material culture, dress reveals evidence of attitudes, beliefs and assumptions of the culture that produced it. A new ideal was beginning to emerge in the 1890s, that of the New American Woman. She was a dynamic independent person who sought companionate relationships with her male associates rather than overly romantic ones. She was college-educated, had

probably held down a job outside of the home at some point in her life and was often interested in sports. She was not necessarily a suffragist, but was most interested in changing women's social roles and exploring new freedoms.[24]

Women of the era found some of their first freedoms in club activities. Club participation was widespread among female South Carolinians. These clubs skyrocketed in popularity, often beginning as organizations to improve the status of less fortunate women.[25] These various organizations provided women both with greater social opportunities, and a chance to learn the techniques of leadership in a semi-public environment. The experience of organizing other women taught abilities which could be applied to other areas of the public sphere and gave participants a higher opinion of their own worth. For example, club activity led Julia Ward Howe to conclude that "women must be the moral and spiritual equivalent of man",[26] and on the whole it was an inspirational and educational experience for most women.

Education was another rapidly growing field for women. By 1900, 85,000 women were enrolled in institutes of higher learning, and 31 percent of all college students were female.[27] Women were proving that they could learn and achieve and still not lose their femininity or their health.[28] With the growing numbers of female students, a college education became increasingly accepted and even expected. Reflecting that national development, women's colleges were opening throughout South Carolina to serve local students. Nevertheless, high school remained the culmination for many women in the state and it acquired a certain ritual significance. Female graduates from high school after the turn of the century wore white, high-necked and long-sleeved and skirted gowns similar to simplified wedding gowns. South Carolina commencement dresses follow the standard model and many of the examples in the State Museum collection are dated to specific local graduations.[29] Education had become an essential part of a woman's life in South Carolina.

After graduation either from high school or college, it was increasingly common for a young single woman to work for a while until her eventual marriage. She was expected to give up her job at the same time as her single life, of course, but these few years of freedom and self-support were an exciting new opportunity for many South Carolina women. They were advised in the Charleston Evening Post as early as 1896 to put serious thought into their choice of a job, assessing their skills and talents thoroughly before picking a vocation.[30] Specified clothing deemed appropriate for jobs other than domestic service was rare until the early 1900s, but, by 1904, The State carried an article in their women's section advising women against overdressing for the office. The author suggested neat, well-fitting clothes of a dark shade rather than an elaborate white gown and a huge hat, both fashionable then.[31] An advertisement in the same newspaper in 1913 read: "The New American Woman can be a business woman as well as a homemaker. All avenues are open to her and she justifies the confidence reposed in her. The New American Woman is equally the master of the situation at the counter, the auditor's desk, in the doctor's role or as the legal adviser."[32]

The New American Woman had added another demand to her list by the late 1910s. "The Girl of Today", as she was alternatively called by Dorothy Dix in the March 1916 issue of Good Housekeeping, took the right of citizenship, including equal suffrage, for granted, knowing herself to be "as strong, as intelligent, as of as much importance in the world as her brother, and it is unthinkable to her that he should have privileges which are denied to her."[33] Despite her progressive ideas, the typical modern girl would not be able to vote in most eastern and southern states for yet another four years. Suffrage activity in South Carolina grew slowly. Four women came to speak on women's rights to a group in Spartanburg in May of 1895, and they were "all handsomely dressed, and their speeches greatly enjoyed, but no converts in Spar[tanburg]."[34] By 1919 however, there were twenty-five equal suffrage leagues in various cities and towns in the state, and the vote was granted nationally in 1920.[35]

Another area of growth in women's activities was sports. The first acceptable sports for women to participate in were lawn sports like tennis and croquet, which were viewed as additional courting opportunities. As a result, women were expected to dress in the highest fashion and corsets were required.[36] Even dress reformers seldom suggested much more than shortening the skirt a few inches, so as to preserve the traditional trappings of femininity.[37] Fashionable society made few allowances even for women bicyclists. A bloomer costume, topped off with a jacket and cap, was the accepted outfit for this popular activity, but women were expected to carry skirts in their bicycle basket to put on as soon as they dismounted. Women who walked around in their bloomers were considered "mannish" or "fast", neither one a compliment.[38] The bifurcated skirt was not yet acceptable for horseback riding, so all but the bravest were still restricted to riding side-saddle. Even here, however, some trail blazers were beginning to make a shift, by the late 1890s, adapting men's riding habits for their own use.[39]

Very little by way of specialized clothing was allowed for golf or tennis either, the two other most popular women's sports. Golf skirts were a few inches shorter and pleated to allow for easier movement, much like the walking skirts popular from the early 1900s through the 1910s.[40] Walking skirts and suits were advertised in the Mills Avenue Store in Columbia, among others.[41] A woman was still expected to wear a hat and gloves while out on the links, to preserve her complexion.[42] Long skirts and corsets were also required of tennis players, and their stays often became bloodstained by injuries caused to the wearer if she attempted to play competitively.[43] In 1904, the most popular tennis outfits, according to The State's fashion reporter, were "dainty muslin frocks with floppy lingerie hats", which even she admits were not the most practical attire.[44] Although some brave women had attempted to wear more functional tennis clothes in public competition before, it was not until 1919 that French player Suzanne Leglen was allowed to wear a knee-length tennis dress and no corset in her match at Wimbledon.

Swimming is another sport that benefits from specialized clothing and practicality would seem to dictate its briefness. However, baring too much skin directly conflicted with social expectations of women's proper attire. The swimsuits at the turn of the century were impractical by current standards. They were knee-length short sleeved dresses in silk or wool. According to a 1904 fashion article in The State, these dresses were worn with a suede belt and the bodices were boned, "giving the figure a trim, natty appearance without interfering with the comfort of the bather."[45] By the 1910s and 1920s, as evidenced by suits in the State Museum collection and contemporary pictures, the boning was gone, and sometimes so were the sleeves, but the skirts still were down to at least mid-thigh and the suits were of wool which was scratchy and heavy when wet.[46] In 1916, The Columbia Record carried a series of articles by Annette Kellerman, international swimming record holder and star of a Fox film, instructing women how to swim. The series suggests local interest in the sport, as well as the growing influence of popular culture.[47]

Around the turn of the century, health and beauty began to be perceived as intertwined. A variety of sports programs for women had been instituted at college campuses beginning in the 1890s.[48] Women's articles in South Carolina newspapers carried such recommendations as "there is just one royal road to beauty and that is good health" or that an upright posture is the source of all charm and a girl who neglects her exercise will be outshone by the more athletic one.[49] Even fashion columns agreed that the new healthy woman would never give up her deep breathing for "any fad of fashion".[50] Comparatively, both sports and everyday clothes were becoming less restricting and more conducive to easy movement and exercise. They changed in response to the shift in society's attitude towards what a woman was capable of doing.

Another shift appeared in the ways in which women attired themselves and their families between the 1890s and the mid 1920s. In the 1890s, ready-to-wear for women was virtually non-existent and women in South Carolina and across the nation had to hire dressmakers or do all of their sewing

themselves, which was time-consuming and could be quite difficult if they were trying to keep up with the extensively tailored and fitted styles of the time. Neighbors in the upstate would organize sewing parties to keep each other company while engaged in dressmaking.[51] As the result of gradual changes, among them the growth of the ready-made clothing industry and the easy-fitting clothes then fashionable, it was simpler by the 1920s for women to dress themselves with a minimum of time and expense. The cost of ready-made clothing had not increased significantly since the turn of the century, so it was still possible for a woman to dress herself for under $100 a year judging from prices advertised in South Carolina newspapers.[52]

If they could, most women took their clothes to a dressmaker in the 1890s and 1900s. With the complicated styles of the period, it was extremely difficult to cut the fabric and construct it properly into a dress, blouse skirt or suit. A great deal of material was required for these pieces as well, so it was expensive to make a mistake. The sewing machine had been invented in the 1850s and made stitching pieces together easier, but was no help with the cutting.[53] There were some dressmaking drafting systems available for the home or amateur dressmaker, but these were often expensive and difficult to use. The earliest paper patterns started to be available in the late nineteenth century, with sizing based upon the sizings found in the drafting systems.[54] Also, some of the fashion publications subscribed to by South Carolina women such as Godey's Lady's Book and Peterson's Magazine began to include measurements with their fashion plates.[55] There were options available for the woman who could not hire someone to make her clothes, but none of them were easy unless she was naturally talented with a needle.

Despite the popular association of sewing with women's work, it has never been an innate talent for most, a fact emphasized in a 1916 book about the dressmaking trade.[56] However, it was one of the earliest respectable occupations open to women and there was a definite need for their services, so a number of women entered the trade. Seamstressing was the more general profession which encompassed all kinds of sewing, complicated or not. Dressmaking primarily entailed the construction of the completed dress fashions of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[57] Seamstresses were more common in South Carolina, as few markets in the state were large enough to support a full-time dressmaker. The same problems that attended home dressmaking, such as the importance of cutting and achievement of the proper fit, were also present in professional sewing. Fashions in these decades had a lot of curves, which all had to be fit. Moreover, although movement was restricted in these clothes, it still had to be allowed for in designing the dress.[58] Most dresses were built up from a lining, which was a plain garment made to fit the customer tightly. The various and changing drapes and swags of fabric prevalent on these dresses were tacked onto this simple understructure. To achieve the fashionable styles, dressmakers had to cut curved complex patterns with many pieces.[59]

Dressmaking was a difficult skill to learn, so the seamstresses in South Carolina and elsewhere made use of the ever improving paper patterns or the variety of dressmaking drafting systems on the market. These included both proportional and direct measurement systems, such as the McDowell Garment Drafting Machine.[60] The proportional sizing structure found in these patterns and systems was applied directly to the sizing of garments for the ready-made clothing industry. As a result, the various aids developed to assist the dressmaker and the home sewer such as these had the ironic effect of greatly contributing to the growth of the ready-made clothing industry. Cutters for the large mail-order department stores would never even see their client, even if they were making custom dresses to order. Each catalog had specific instructions for the customer to measure herself. She then sent in the figures, including an old dress lining if she had one.[61] A further irony is that the growth of the ready-made clothing industry led directly to the decline of the private dressmaker. They were still being used throughout the 1920s, but mostly for evening dresses and special occasion attire. For everyday clothes, most women shopped for ready-made.

Women could acquire ready-made clothing in a variety of ways. The first big mail-order catalogs such as Montgomery Ward and Sears Roebuck began to appear in the 1890s and made a wide variety of goods available across the country. For example, Georgia Cleveland of Spartanburg, SC ordered a bill of goods from Montgomery Wards on July 28, 1892.[62] However, in the first catalogs, almost twice as many pages were devoted to fabrics as to ladies' ready-made garments.[63] By the later 1900s and 1910s, fashions had changed enough, becoming increasingly less structured and tightly fitted, that it became profitable to produce ready-made garments on a large scale. Better quality clothing became available and even respectable women began buying these clothes for everyday use.[64] The popularity and sale volume of the mail order catalogs expanded, and ever greater numbers of pages were devoted to ready-made clothing at the expense of fabrics.[65]

Acceptance of ready-made clothing was reflected in the development of the local department stores in Columbia and Charleston. They began in the 1890s primarily as dry goods shops, specializing in fabrics and sometimes shoes.[66] At most they might sell corsets and other undergarments, and by the end of the decade some sold tailored coat suits, skirts and shirtwaists, which did not require the tight fit of fashionable dresses. Tellingly, Louis Cohen claims as a selling point in an 1896 advertisement for his store that his shirtwaists have "that Tailor-made effect which the ordinary ready-made waists do not."[67] It is very interesting, however, to observe the gradual shift in the stock noted in other advertisements as the twentieth century progresses. Louis Cohen's store in Charleston was one of the first in the city to list ready-made dresses in his advertisements, while Tapp's department store, which opened in Columbia in October 1903, advertised "imported evening gowns" from the start.[68] More stores opened, and their stock of clothing expanded at the expense of their dry goods department through the next twenty years. The advertisements became more sophisticated as well, showing drawings of fashionably dressed women next to the lists of their stock on sale. Tapp's had done this from the beginning, but the other stores were relatively quick to follow.[69]

Although most of these South Carolina stores offered alterations in-house, they were beginning to be a luxury, much like custom dressmaking, by the 1910s and 1920s. The growth of the ready-to-wear industry had caused women to view their clothes very differently In the past, clothing was made and later altered to update its fashionableness. It was easier to make dresses over because they had more material and because they were custom-made for the wearer. Some women would buy extra fabric at the time their clothing was made, so that they could bring it back to the dressmaker to be refashioned as changing styles or wear dictated. The Charleston Evening Post in 1896 advised middle-class women to save their pennies and spend them on one really nice tailor-made gown in a non-trendy fabric such as serge or broadcloth that could be made over to last many seasons.[70] South Carolina women also spent painstaking hours refurbishing dresses at home. Women's magazines and newspapers carried explicit suggestions for alterations. For example, between 1870 and 1914, Harper's Bazaar offered 115 ideas for remaking clothes.[71] The Fashion Chat section in the Post also contained advice for freshening up an old dress for the new season.[72] Alterations were quite difficult, even from the professional's standpoint, because they were the reverse of dressmaking. Gowns had to be made over from the outside rather than built up from a base, and it took creativity to preserve the original line of the dress.[73] January through April and September through October were the most popular months for remodeling as women attempted to update their wardrobes for the new season.[74] When a dress was completely worn out, it was often cut down into a bicycling or other sports outfit, until specialized sports clothes became common.

Ready-made costumes were much more difficult to reuse. There was less fabric to them: 2 7/8 yard of 54" wool or cotton in a 1924 example, as compared to 5 7/8 yards of 44" fabric, plus 1/2 yard of 40" net and 1 3/4 yards edging, on a sample dress of 1914.[75] It was not made specifically to the wearer's measurements, either. Furthermore, as clothing became cheaper and easier to obtain, there was less need

or desire to remake clothing. Women began updating their wardrobe by purchasing new pieces rather than making things over. Separates had existed since 1872, but they only became popular in this century.[76] The necessity of knowing enough sewing to refashion old clothing had sharply diminished by the 1920s. Dressmaking and Millinery advised that a woman only needed to know enough about sewing to keep her clothes in good condition and to know if she was getting the best values when she purchased them.[77]

The new ready-to wear clothes were also easier to maintain than the old custom tailored clothes. Many of those were made of hard-to-wash fabrics, and taking them apart for refurbishment was such a major undertaking that a woman often waited many seasons and had the dress made over in a new style at the same time. Laundry day was always stressful and most women who could afford servants had them wash the clothes. As women began to work more outside the home in office and professional positions, they needed simple clothes in washable materials, such as calico, gingham and chambray.[78] The department store advertisements from the local South Carolina newspapers in the 1910s and 1920s increasingly advertised wash suits and many more washable fabrics.[79] Clothing was simpler, more accessible, and more disposable. South Carolina women wore it and washed it until either the garment was worn out or more likely, out of fashion, and got rid of it, rather than laboriously remaking it over the years.

Simpler fashions actually betokened a more complex lifestyle for the South Carolina women who wore them. By the early 1920s, many women worked outside the home, at least before their marriage, went to high schooi and often college, and were allowed to vote and take part in public life, without fear of ostracism. The girl of that era could play sports, drive cars, go to the movies, dance all night, and indulge in a variety of other diversions which were not open to her mother and grandmother. The long, loose, free-flowing clothes of the time reflected her new freedom of movement in both the physical and the social sphere. If one closely examines the clothing of South Carolina women from 1890 through 1925, one finds a gradual loosening and freeing of the restraints, symbolic and actual, on women's movement. As illustrated by the costume collection of the South Carolina State Museum and contemporary written material, there was a gradual but steady progression from tight sleeves, bodices and corsets with heavy layers of skirts, which were so long that they trailed on the ground, to slightly shorter and freer golf and walking skirts in the early 1900s. Then the looser and more practical blouses and tailored suits of the same period yielded to the ever simpler and gradually shorter dresses of the 1910s. Finally, the knee-length, sleeveless flapper dresses which made their first appearance in 1925 completed the transition. The clothing of the 1910s is the best symbol of the on-going transition, as is women's role in that decade. It was still very feminine, with soft pastel colors, deep ruffles and long lines. Women continued to wear corsets underneath the new softer dresses, although they had slid down the body to rest on the hips and no longer cinched the waist in so tyrannically. The fashionable woman in South Carolina was freer than she had been in decades, if not centuries, but she did not yet have the freedom of clothing she would attain within ten years. Women were also beginning to bob their hair, and experiment with the traditional aesthetic of femininity, much as they were experimenting with new social possibilities.

It is this decade that is really the key to understanding the changing social roles of women as reflected in their clothes from 1890 to 1925. By the end of the 1910s, women had achieved most of the social freedoms they were going to have until nearly the 1960s. The vote came to every woman at the end of the decade in 1920, but a woman's social freedom to pursue her own life was already generally acceptable by then. These liberties were all available to the women of South Carolina. Their development mirrored that of women in the rest of the nation, as evidenced by diaries, newspaper and magazine articles, advertisements, and the clothes they wore. The most visible expression of a woman's

character and social role is in her clothing. South Carolina women dressed as well and as fashionably as everyone else.

ENDNOTES

[1]Charles H. Gibbs-Smith, The Fashionable Lady in the 19th Century (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1960), 32-34.

[2]Estelle Ansley Worrell, American Costume 1840-1920 (Harrisburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 1979), 119.

[3]Worrell, 130, 131.

[4]Rueta Louise Childe, "The Spring Time Girl", The State, 8 Apr. 1891, 6. Heliotrope is a light shade of purple.

[5]Olive Harper, "Fashions of Spring", The State, 17 Apr. 1891, 3.

[6]South Carolina State Museum Collection, Dresses, 95.91.1, 83.97.5, 80.9.26.

[7]David Bond, The Guinness Guide to 20th Century Fashion (Enfield, Middlesex, U.K.: Guinness Publishing, Ltd., 1988), 30.

[8]Bond, 12, 15.

[9]Elizabeth Ewing, History of 20th Century Fashion (Totowa, NJ: Barnes and Noble, 1986), 10.

[10]Bull Dry Goods Co., Advertisement, The State, 21 Oct. 1909, 12. Fitzmaurice's Department Store, Advertisement, The State, 28 Nov. 1909, 18. J.C. Moore & Son, Advertisement, The State, 24 Oct. 1909, 29. Young's Department Store, Advertisement, The State, 11 Oct. 1903, 13.

[11]J.L. Mimnaugh's, Advertisement, The State, 11 Oct., 1903, 3. R.H. Edmunds, Advertisement, The State, 12 Oct. 1903, 7. Tapp's Department Store, Advertisement, The State, 7 Oct., 1903, 5. Tapp's Department Store, Advertisement, The State, 14 Oct. 1903, 8.

[12]Kerrison's, Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 5 Jan. 1916, 2. W.T. Farley's, Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 17 Dec. 1915, 7. Werter and Rosenbloom, Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 30 Mar. 1907, 4. Tapp's Department Store, Advertisement, The State, 20 Oct. 1909, 10. J.C. Moore & Son, Advertisement, The State, 24 Oct. 1909, 29. Fitzmaurice's Department Store, Advertisement, The State, 24 Oct. 1909, 29. Sears Roebuck Catalogue, #111, 1902, reprinted by Bounty Books, New York, 1969. Sears Roebuck Catalogue, #117, 1908, reprinted by DBI Books, Inc., Northfield, IL, 1971.

[13]Georgia Cleveland, Diary, 1890-1914, South Caroliniana Library, Columbia, S.C., 9 Jan. 1911.

[14]Bond, 32.

[15]Bond, 54.

[16]Bond, 41.

[17]Cleveland, Diary, 15 Oct. 1913.

[18]Bond, 37.

[19]Bond, 59, 61.

[20]Furchgott's Department Store, Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 14 Jan. 1924, 14. Furchgott's Department Store, Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 31 Jan. 1924, 14. Kerrison's Department Store, Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 11 Jan. 1924, 1. Louis Cohen's Department Store, Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 11 Jan. 1924, 1.

[21]Flaming Youth, Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 14 Jan. 1924, 5.

[22]South Carolina State Museum Collection, Dresses, 82.53.11, 82.88.4, 83.127.14.

[23]Marilyn J. Horn and Lois M. Gunel, The Second Skin: An Interdisciplinary Study of Clothing (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981), 190. Beverly Chico, "Review of Dress and Gender: Making and Meaning", Dress 19 (1992), 87.

[24]Nancy Woloch, Early American Women, A Documentary History, 1600-1900 (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1992), 528.

[25]Woloch, 475-477.

[26]Julia Ward Howe, Reminiscences, 1819-1899 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1899), 376,377.

[27]Woloch, 441.

[28]Woloch, 442.

[29]Elizabeth Weyburn, "Rites of Passage: A Journey to Womanhood", Atlanta History XL 1-2 (Spring-Summer 1996), 63. South Carolina State Museum Collection, Dresses, 81.13.2, 1906 graduation dress, 81.48.1, 1915 graduation dress worn at Newberry High School.

[30]"Choosing a Vocation" Charleston Evening Post, 29 Aug. 1896, 6.

[31]"Untitled", The State, 24 Jul. 1904, 18.

[32]The State Want Ads, Advertisement, The State, 9 May 1913, 6.

[33]Dorothy Dix, "The Girl of Today", Good Housekeeping (March 1916), 291.

[34]Cleveland, Diary, May 3, 1895.

[35]"Large Meeting South Carolina Suffrage League", The Columbia Record, 16 Jan. 1919, 7.

[36]Patricia Warner Campbell, "Public and Private: Men's Influence on American Women's Dress for Sport and Physical Education", Dress 14 (1988), 51, 52.

[37]Sally Helvenston, "Popular Advice for the Well-Dressed Woman in the 19th Century", Dress 6 (1980), 43.

[38]Campbell, Dress 14 (1988), 51.

[39]"Rides Without Skirts", Charleston Evening Post, 2 Sept. 1896, 6.

[40]Catherine Talbot, "Parisian Midsummer Fashion Conceits", The State, 3 Jul. 1904, 19.

[41]Mills Avenue Store, Advertisement, The State, 11 Oct. 1903, 2.

[42]Worrell, 133.

[43]Campbell, Dress 14 (1988), 51, 52.

[44]Talbot, The State, 3 Jul. 1904, 19.

[45]Talbot, The State, 3 Jul. 1904, 19.

[46]South Carolina State Museum Collection, Bathing Suits, 85.142.48, 85.108.2.

[47]Annette Kellerman, "Annette Kellerman Tells Her Pupils How to Float", The Columbia Record, 20 Aug. 1916, 6.

[48]Campbell, Dress 14 (1988), 51. Ann Buerman Wass and Clarita Anderson, "What Did Women Wear to Run?", Dress 17 (1990), 173. Cleveland, Diary, 13 Nov. 1903.

[49]"Milestones on the Road to Beauty", The State, 31 Oct. 1909, 5. Catherine Talbot, "Untitled", The State, 17 Jul. 1904, 19.

[50]"New Year's Fashions of Paris", The State, 27 Dec. 1903, 8.

[51]Cleveland, Diary, 28 Apr. 1897, 8 Mar. 1901, 7 Oct. 1909.

[52]J.C. Moore, Advertisement, The State, 6 Jul. 1921, 3. Kohn's, Advertisement, The State, 7 Jul. 1921, 5.

[53]Claudia Kidwell, Cutting a Fashionable Fit: Dressmaker's Drafting Systems in the United States (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1979), 20.

[54]Kidwell, 81.

[55]Kidwell, 69.

[56]Edna Bryner, Dressmaking and Millinery (Philadelphia, William F. Fell & Co. Printers, 1916), 13.

[57]Bryner, 25, 26.

[58]Bryner, 27. Kidwell, 16, 18.

[59]Bryner, 29. Kidwell, 45.

[60]Kidwell, 53, 54.

[61]Kidwell, 91, 93.

[62]Cleveland, Diary, 28 Jul. 1892.

[63]Rachel H. Kemper, Costume (New York, Newsweek Books, 1977), 137. Montgomery Ward and Co., Catalogue and Buyers' Guide, No. 56, 1894-5, reprinted by DBI Books, Inc. Northfield, IL, 1977. Montgomery Ward and Co., Catalogue and Buyers' Guide, No. 57, 1895, reprinted by Dover Publications, Inc. New York, 1969. Sears Roebuck Catalogue, #111, 1902, reprinted by Bounty Books, New York, 1969.

[64]Kidwell, 98, 103.

[65]Sears Roebuck Catalogue, #117, 1908, reprinted by DBI Books, Inc. Northfield, IL, 1971. Sears Roebuck Catalogue, #129, 1920, Chicago: Sears Roebuck and Co., 1920.

[66]Jacob's Department Store, Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 4 May 1896, 4. J.L. Mimnaugh's, Advertisement, The State, 29 Mar. 1891, 6. J.R. Reed & Co., Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 27 Aug. 1896, 1. Kerrison's Dry Goods, Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 25 Sept.

1896, 2. Louis Cohen, Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 26 Sept. 1896, 1. McCreery & Brother, Advertisement, The State, 18 Feb. 1891, 3. The Hub, Advertisement, The State, 26 Aug., 1894, 8.

[67]Louis Cohen & Co., Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 4 May 1896, 3.

[68]Furchgott's Department Store, Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 26 Mar, 1907, 6. Kerrison's Department Store, Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 26 Mar. 1907, 6. Louis Cohen & Co., Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 26 Mar. 1907, 6. Tapp's Department Store, Advertisement, The State, 8 Oct. 1903, 8.

[69]Fitzmaurice's Department Store, Advertisement, The State, 11 Oct. 1903, 8. J.C. Moore and Sons, Advertisement, The State, 18 Oct. 1903, 4. Tapp's Department Store, Advertisement, The State, 10 Oct. 1903, 1. Young's Department Store, Advertisement, The State, 11 Oct. 1903, 13.

[70]"The Girl With One Gown", Charleston Evening Post, 23 Sept. 1896, 6.

[71]Jane Farrell-Beck and Joyce Starr Johnson, "Remodeling and Renovating Clothes, 1870-1923", Dress 19 (1992), 38.

[72]"Fashion Chat", Charleston Evening Post, 26 Aug. 1896, 6.

[73]Bryner, 35, 36.

[74]Farrell-Beck and Johnson, 39.

[75]Farrell-Beck and Johnson, 39.

[76]Farrell-Beck and Johnson, 44.

[77]Bryner, 14, 15.

[78]Joan Gregory Ritter and Betty L. Feather, "Practices, Procedures and Attitude Towards Clothing Maintenance, 1850-1860 and 1900-1910", Dress 17 (1990), 159, 160, 162.

[79]J.L. Mimnaugh's, Advertisement, The State, 13 Apr. 1913, 16. Furchgott's Department Store, Advertisement, Charleston Evening Post, 9 Jan. 1924, 14. Ladies' Toggery Shop, Advertisement, The State, 10 Apr. 1913, 14.

Landscapes of Reform: The Material Culture of the New Deal
in Manchester, South Carolina, 1934-1945

The years between 1933 and 1945 were a period of enormous economic and social change in the rural South. In a relatively short span of time, land reform policies of the New Deal helped to transform the postbellum South into the modern South. Several historians have noted that New Deal agricultural programs, particularly those of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA), caused the final demise of an economy based on cotton production and farm tenancy. Revolutionary change often brought new economic hardships, as federal crop reduction incentives led to the displacement of numerous tenant farmers and laborers from the land. Peter Daniel and others emphasized the destructive impact of the AAA's programs, and asserted that the relief efforts of the Resettlement and Farm Security Administrations failed to mitigate rural suffering.[1] Daniel suggested that "to find the most revolutionary aspects of the New Deal in the South, one must look not to the welfare programs that pacified the dispossessed . . . but rather to the changing structure of agriculture fueled by the AAA."[2] However, historians should view the "welfare programs" of these agencies in the broader context of New Deal land reform, which included massive conservation projects designed to sustain local communities through new productive land uses. In this sense, agricultural reform also encompassed the development of numerous resettlement communities, national and state forests, and public parks, all of which restored millions of acres of sub-marginal land across the South.

In the process, New Deal land reform policies created new rural landscapes that differed in appearance, as well as in social meaning, from those that existed before. Previous southern landscapes were associated with unproductive farming, poverty, and social inequality, especially in the case of African American tenant farmers. Though efforts on behalf of these farmers were limited by traditions of southern racism and local opposition, some blacks benefited substantially from New Deal programs. The Farm Security Administration (FSA), in particular, worked to establish more productive land uses, and to provide economic security for at least a small number of African Americans. This agency's commitment to non-discriminatory racial policy radically altered existing social relationships in parts of the South, and as a result the FSA became known as a "disturber of the peace."[3] In fact, historian William E. Leuchtenburg has claimed that there "is a high correlation between the location of extensive FSA operations in the 1930s and the rapidity of political modernization in black communities in the South in the 1960s."[4] While other historians have stopped short of making such extensive claims, some have agreed that the New Deal programs helped to foster a sense of independence and hope that prepared the way for the civil rights movement two decades later.[5] The transformation of the South's rural landscapes was part of this social and political modernization of southern black communities.

A local case study of the new landscapes created by one project at Manchester, South Carolina, reveals much about the reformist goals and achievements of the New Deal. Prior to 1934, the Manchester area was a cotton farming community in which impoverished farmers and laborers attempted to find subsistence on the infertile, unproductive land of the Carolina Sandhills. However, between 1934 and 1945, a series of government agencies brought to Manchester an ambitious land reform project that materially replaced the cotton farming landscape with Poinsett State Park, the Tiverton Farms resettlement community, and Manchester State Forest. Encompassing over 33,000 acres, the Manchester project area was located in the High Hills of Santee, a part of the Sandhills of central South Carolina. Heavily forested and used today mainly by hunters, loggers, and recreationists, Manchester is located

between the towns of Wedgefield and Pinewood, perched on the high land above the Wateree River Swamp. Though the name of Manchester disappeared from maps of South Carolina in the late nineteenth century, it is the most convenient label for the area of this study.

In order to understand how the New Deal intervention affected the Manchester landscape and its people, it is necessary to examine the history and material culture of the earlier cotton farming system that dominated the area prior to 1934. During the first three decades of the twentieth century, a cotton and corn farming system, in which cotton provided income for absentee landowners, local merchants, and a hierarchy of resident farmers, fueled the Manchester economy.[6] At the top of this hierarchy of farm workers were small independent owner-operators, who owned marginally profitable farms typically about fifty acres in size.[7] Below the owner-operators was a large group that cultivated the land of the absentee landowners on the old plantation tracts of the postbellum period: these were tenants and farm laborers. Thus, prior to 1934, Manchester was still a working farm community, boasting a population of one hundred and sixty-eight families in Manchester Township alone. Of this population, eighty-nine percent were black or mulatto, and only thirty-seven percent of the total population were independent landowners. The remaining sixty-three percent of families cultivated the lands of the mainly white absentee landlords, working as tenants and laborers in some kind of dependent or semi-dependent fashion.[8]

Though the owner-operators played an important role in the Manchester economy, the tenants and laborers were affected most dramatically by the New Deal land reform of the 1930s. Following the Civil War, landowners and former slaves sought to negotiate a new farm labor system, a process which resulted in the rise of widespread land tenancy across the South. By the eve of the Depression, millions of tenants and sharecroppers tilled land which they did not own, with disastrous economic results. As historian Paul E. Mertz has noted, the southern tenant farmers were "the most impoverished and backward large group of producers in America."[9] At Manchester, Robert Kelly Sr. was a representative tenant farmer who rented land on the old Tiverton Plantation tract from 1920 to 1939. In 1937 the Kelly family rented a total of thirty acres, and cultivated with one mule twelve acres of cotton, twelve of corn, and six of miscellaneous crops. Kelly was able to break even as a tenant until 1933, after which time he gradually began to lose money and became heavily indebted to his landlord. Though Kelly farmed a tract of roughly the same acreage as the independent owner-operators, he did not own his own dwelling, his household furnishings, or the land on which he worked. These things were all supplied by his landlord for which he paid a cash rent, rather than a share of the crop.[10]

The farm laborers who existed at the lowest end of the economic scale were also a part of the early twentieth-century cotton farming system in Manchester. As late as 1920, large plantation owners still relied on the farm-labor system, which had roots in antebellum cotton farming traditions. Some of these laborers were dependent children who worked to supplement the income of tenants or small farmers. Many Manchester families, however, earned the bulk of their income as wage laborers, either employed directly by absentee landowners, or through labor agreements with neighboring tenant farmers who needed extra help. Typically, these laboring families had the lowest incomes of all those residing in Manchester. Most often they were hired during periods when extra work was available, such as during the summer and during the fall cotton picking season. Because such employment was intermittent, these families were often in precarious situations economically, and were the most dependent of the three types of farmers.[11] Robert Medlin was an example of the type of laborer who helped a tenant farmer work his farm, and then by agreement worked four acres for himself on which he grew cotton and corn on a very small scale. Like the tenants, Medlin owned very little, since his employer controlled the house in which he lived and the farm equipment that he used. However, in 1937, after discounting the relief money from the government, the Medlin family grossed only one hundred and ten dollars, earned from the labor the whole family performed on the tenant's farm and from cotton that they raised on their own.[12]

This early twentieth-century cotton farming system, and the material culture associated with it, was the defining aspect of Manchester's 1920-1934 landscape. To begin with, the cotton system and culture dominated the landscape. As mentioned previously, one hundred and sixty-eight families, whose main task and livelihood was the cultivation of cotton, lived in the area in 1920. The years between 1920 and 1935 brought little change; the cotton system remained, and most of the same families continued farming in Manchester the way they always had. By 1935 a typical plantation tract in Manchester was made up of approximately sixty-six percent of cropland, the great majority of which was planted in cotton. Some parcels, such as those belonging to the owner-operators typically contained larger amounts of land in cultivation.[13] Cotton farming probably was the most noticeable physical feature of the landscape, and though some portions of Manchester were forested or lying waste, a typical Manchester scene must have included the straight, mule-plowed furrows of the cotton fields. More importantly, however, the cotton system carried with it a material culture that defined the landscape. This included a complex network of roads and paths, wasted or undervalued forest land, poor quality tenant and laborer housing, and community structures, all of which expressed the economic and social inequalities of the postbellum cotton farming system.

The numerous roads and paths that crisscrossed the landscape were a significant material feature that developed out of the cotton farming regime. A series of maps of the old Tiverton Plantation tracts shows a bewildering web of lines, some of which joined farms to other farms, and some of which allowed access to the surrounding fields and woodlands. It seems that these roads grew by accretion, with some dating to the colonial period. As land uses changed and settlement patterns shifted, new networks of roads were layered over old, creating an intricate web. People used these networks for a variety of different purposes, and consequently the roads had different meanings for the Manchester residents.[14] For absentee landowners, roads primarily had an economic use, as they connected the farm and plantation to the cotton gin, the warehouse, and to distant markets. For Ferdinand Levi, or J.J. Geddings, two absentee landowners, the roads of Manchester were the conduits used to turn crops into profit. For tenants and laborers, roads and paths connected the rented house to the field where work was performed, and from there led to the merchant or landlord who controlled the credit that was in many cases necessary for survival.[15] Thus, the inequalities of the economic relationships that were integral to the cotton farming system not only shaped the Manchester landscape, but filled it with social meaning as well.

Because Manchester residents were so dependent on cotton for survival, the approximately forty percent of the land that contained timber and brush may have appeared as wasted and useless. It is difficult to understand the landscape without being able to picture this large portion of it, and what meaning it might have had for local residents. Unfortunately, the land appraisals give little idea of the nature and makeup of the pre-1935 forests. However, it is possible to determine the state of succession of the forest in these areas, and from this extrapolate the appearance of the Manchester woodlands of the early 1930s. Some of these "waste" areas had once been farms or plantations where the soil was exhausted or eroded to the point where it could no longer support a family. These lands were allowed to sit idle, and eventually they had become reforested. Though some timber harvesting was carried out in the 1920s, most of the commercially valuable trees had been logged between 1890-1920.[16] According to Arthur Raper, who studied the land-use practices of the South's "black belt," or cotton farming regions, many of the small farmers and tenants traditionally used fire to clear harvested cotton and corn fields, to clear briars, and to kill pests such as rattlesnakes and the boll weevil. In many cases these fires would get out of control and burn more than the farmer intended. Because the forested areas were of little value to residents, these fires were often allowed to burn unchecked. As a result, the forested areas were probably dominated by the fire-tolerant tree species of the southern Sandhills region: longleaf pine and turkey

oak.[17] Compared to cotton, this undeveloped, unmanaged resource offered little economically to the farmers of Manchester.

The dwellings and farm buildings were also a notable features of the landscape. In 1920, there were one hundred and thirty-eight dwellings listed by the census in Manchester Township. While the houses might not have physically dominated the landscape, their poor condition certainly must have been an integral aspect. Jerry Walker, a local resident, described the tenant farm house in which he lived as a child, on the McLaurin tract in Manchester, as being a small house that served simply as shelter. He remembered that as a boy, he could lie in bed at night and see the stars and moon through the cracks in the roof and walls. The government land appraisal report of 1935 simply indicated that the Walkers' house was a fifty year old frame house, with dimensions of eighteen by twenty-four feet (only 432 square feet), that was described as being in "poor condition."[18] The conditions of southern sharecropper and tenant farmer housing in the 1930s have been well documented; Raper described the tenant houses of the "black belt" as unsanitary, cramped, uninsulated buildings, with leaking roofs and screenless windows.[19] It seems likely that the tenant houses of Manchester shared many of the same characteristics. More than any other feature of the cotton farming landscape the housing expressed the poverty and poor standard of living of many local residents.

Finally, the structures associated with community interaction helped to define the landscape as well. Most importantly, buildings such as cotton gins, warehouses, mercantile establishments, plantation commissaries, rural schools, and churches, may have stood out in the landscape as symbols of power (or lack of power) and social organization that were crucial in defining community. Prior to 1934, at least two stores and one plantation commissary supplied local farmers with seed, fertilizer, equipment, foodstuffs, and household furnishings, generally on credit. The stores that dotted the Manchester landscape served as points of contact between the black owner-operators, tenants, laborers, and the generally white merchants and landlords to whom they were indebted.[20] Three schools for "coloreds," tucked in the forested areas, provided cotton farmers and their families with what little education they possessed.[21] Finally, at least five rural churches, each with racially segregated congregations, provided a place to meet with other residents of similar backgrounds, and served to reinforce race and class separation. Many of the black tenant farmers and laborers attended either Orangehill Reformed Methodist United Episcopal, Orangehill African Methodist Episcopal, or Tiverton Missionary Baptist church. Many small owner-operators, who the 1920 census listed as "mulatto" were members of St. Augustine Episcopal church. St. Mark's Episcopal, an old planter church, had an entirely white congregation. Each of these churches was the center of a community within the larger community, and it is possible that the Manchester area was segregated geographically along distinct race and class lines.[22]

This landscape, created by the southern cotton farming system, was dominated and defined by many of the rural problems which the New Deal land reformers hoped to solve. Since the early 1920s agricultural economists and sociologists had argued that the South's farm problems, extensive rural poverty, and poor material living conditions could be solved through land reform. M. L. Wilson of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics believed that rural poverty was caused in part by over production, and in part by farmers attempting to make a living on sub-marginal, infertile land. By taking this type of land out of cultivation, land-utilization planners could reduce surplus production that depressed farm prices, and materially assist the farmers that the Depression and sub-marginal land had left in extremely precarious positions.[23] Wilson was able to put these ideas into action under the auspices of the New Deal's Agricultural Adjustment Act, which in 1933 created an division that would acquire sub-marginal land, relocate the farmers, and put the land to more productive uses such as forestry or grazing.

By 1935, the concept of land reform had broadened to include not just economic improvement for poor farmers, but a complete rethinking of the structure of rural society and culture. Gradually, Wilson's

ideas were fused with those of Rexford Tugwell, head of the Resettlement Administration during Franklin Roosevelt's second term in office. Tugwell believed that poor farmers, especially those in the South, could never become fully independent unless the structure and institutions that dominated southern rural life were reorganized. He argued that this could be achieved by dismantling the cotton farming system, and replacing it with model farming communities designed around tenets of cooperation and land ownership.[24] Simultaneously, the National Park Service, under the leadership of Stephen Mather, Harold Ickes, and Conrad Wirth, became interested in improving the cultural life of rural people through the creation of state parks systems in every state. Though the state park movement became popular in the early 1920s, the Depression and the New Deal offered the opportunity to put the movement's ideals into action on a massive scale. The state park planners believed that communal recreation and proximity to nature could better the lives of the poor and those living in rural areas. Consequently, a large number of state parks and Recreation Demonstration Areas, designed with the lower income classes in mind and built by the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), became part of the same land reform projects planned by Wilson, Tugwell, and others in the Roosevelt Administration.[25]

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA) and the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) targeted the Manchester area in 1934 as an area of sub-marginal land in need of reform.[26] Essentially, this massive project was organized into three separate efforts designed to transform Manchester from wasted cotton farms into productive lands that would support the local population economically as well as culturally. The first of these efforts involved the development of a state park for recreation. In 1934 the South Carolina State Commission of Forestry cooperated with the National Park Service and the CCC to design and construct Poinsett State Park, and its satellites Mill Creek and Burnt Gin group camps. The goal of this project was to implement the ideals of the state park movement, to turn wasted land into a place for recreation, appreciation of nature, and fraternal cooperation.[27] The second leg of the land reform project was the creation of Tiverton Farms, a farming community for a select group of the tenant farmers who had been living in Manchester. In this effort, managed by the Resettlement Administration and later the Farm Security Administration (FSA), tenants and laborers would be moved off the sub-marginal land and resettled onto the most productive land within the overall project area, with the hope that this would raise their economic status and general well-being. Central to this plan was the desire on the part of the planners to replace the poor quality tenant dwellings with new, decent government housing. Additionally, the Resettlement Administration hoped to make the community self-sufficient by providing farmers with subsistence farms and access to communal pasture and woodlot. The third aspect of the project was begun in 1935 when the AAA initiated a forestry demonstration area in which 30,000 acres of sub-marginal crop land was purchased, reforested, and used to create a "permanent rural industry."[28] Central to the forest demonstration plan was the idea that reforestation would provide immediate work relief for local residents, who would plant seedlings and build roads and fire-breaks; similarly, once the forest was established residents would benefit economically, either directly, as they were employed by the forest, or indirectly, as the production of forest products expanded the local economy. Together, the state park, the resettlement area, and the forest demonstration area, were meant to cover the entirety of Manchester township and part of Middleton and Fulton townships as well, a total of well over 30,000 acres.

Though these efforts were funded, implemented, and managed by different agencies, they all had the ultimate goal of taking care of the sub-marginal land problem in Manchester. In this manner, each agency worked towards achieving real land reform at Manchester using a different method. The result was the creation of a new "public landscape" that expressed a number of the ideals of the New Deal: the state parks movement's desire to provide opportunities for recreation and cultural development for the

poor, the Resettlement Administration's ideal of the self-sufficient, cooperative farmer, and AAA's goal of eliminating the wastage of resources and people.[29]

Probably the most significant impact that the Manchester land reform project had on the material nature of the area was that it caused the cotton farming landscape to gradually disappear between 1934 and 1956. To make room for the new state park and the forestry demonstration area the New Deal agencies and the State of South Carolina eventually required many local residents to vacate land that the government had purchased. Though the AAA began appraising and purchasing land in 1934, it was in no hurry to push the local farmers off the land, and consequently, it was not until 1938 that the government became serious about relocating the residents. By this time the AAA had been declared unconstitutional and replaced with the Resettlement Administration; when the Resettlement Administration was dissolved in 1937 the project was passed in turn to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Soil Conservation Service, and the FSA.[30]

And so it was the FSA that sent out letters, in 1938, to the remaining landowners and tenants, politely but firmly telling them to vacate the houses in which they were living, and move from the project area. In the years following this, the tenants, laborers, and owner-operators, with the exception of those selected for the resettlement community, gradually moved away. Project workers destroyed the houses to avoid squatter occupancy, to discourage trespass and poaching, and to protect the new forest from human-caused fire. Relocated residents were assisted through home-ownership grants, loans, and advice from the FSA, and it is worth noting that this gradual change was implemented in a fairly humane manner. While the farmers were still living in the area they were employed as laborers or foremen on the project, and the old farmhouses were maintained at the state government's expense until families were able to move. In some cases this maintenance ranged from reroofing the structures to wiring them for electricity.[31]

In this manner, as residents were able to leave and find other options, the number of people living in Manchester and the number of houses decreased. In 1940, eighty-two families cultivating 1,360 acres of land remained in Manchester; by 1945 this number had dropped to thirty-four and 800 respectively. Finally, by 1956, only twenty-six of the original one hundred and thirty-eight dwellings remained.[32] Today, apparently none of the pre-1934 farm houses are left in Manchester State Forest, and a survey of the woods today reveals only the occasional pile of bricks, coquina stone foundations, broken bottles, and a few scraps of rusty metal.[33] Thus, one of the most significant cotton farming landscape features, the farm houses themselves, disappeared as a result of the implementation of New Deal land reform policies. As the old landscape disappeared, it was rapidly replaced with a landscape that expressed the new uses to which the land was being turned, and the intents of the New Deal land reformers. Poinsett State Park, created in the center of the project area, was the first attempt to implement New Deal goals in Manchester. Begun in 1934, the combined efforts of the National Park Service, the CCC, and the South Carolina State Forestry Commission had by 1938 transformed the unlikely landscape of worn out cotton farms and swamp into a woodland resort, complete with lake, beach, tennis courts, vacation cabins, campground, and nature trails. Additionally, the government constructed two satellites of Poinsett State Park, Burnt Gin and Mill Creek group camps, within the project area in order to provide recreational opportunities for families, organized groups, and African Americans.[34]

The landscape features and material elements of Poinsett State Park exemplified the New Deal ideal that coexistence with and exposure to nature could improve the quality of life for Americans. In what has been called the "government rustic style" of architecture and landscape design, the National Park Service designers attempted to emphasize the need for native plants and materials, and harmony of the built environment with nature.[35] The vacation cabins at Poinsett, built by the CCC in 1935, embodied these ideals in that they made use of local coquina rock for foundations and chimneys, and cypress from the nearby swamp for interior paneling. Additionally, their positioning on the land, as well as their

architectural design, helped to fit them unobtrusively into Poinsett's forested landscape. Similarly, the roads and trails in the park, created by the CCC to bring visitors into proximity with nature, were designed to harmonize with the natural topography of the land in Manchester.

However, because the pre-1935 landscape was dominated by the features of the cotton farming system, the CCC had to create a new idealized natural landscape. In the case of Poinsett, some areas were cleared agricultural land, and some areas were unmanaged waste, forest, or swamp land. In order to create the new park environment the state park planners embarked upon a campaign of "landscape naturalization" in which local native plants were transplanted into areas of erosion, disturbance, and open fields.[36] An excellent example of this type of effort occurred in the area surrounding the bath house in the heart of the state park. Prior to 1935, this area was a cleared field adjacent to an old grist mill on Shank's creek. After completing the new bath house, the CCC carried out a massive landscaping project in which they transplanted native flora, such as dogwood, mountain laurel, waxmyrtle, leucothoe, and live oak into the old field, transforming it into a wooded picnic area.[37] In the process of redesigning the landscape, the CCC also spent hundreds of hours eradicating poisonous plants from the area around the new picnic spot to make it safe, as well as beneficial, for future visitors.[38]

Another doctrine of the New Deal and the parks movement was that cooperative recreation, with nature as a backdrop, could also improve quality of life. Consequently, the CCC developed a communal fire circle in the campground, and a public swimming beach at Poinsett State Park. In many parks, sports such as baseball, horseshoes, shuffleboard, and tennis were encouraged in order to develop a cooperative spirit in visitors. However, it is the structures of the group camps of the Manchester project that provide the most eloquent testimony to this communal park ideal. Both Burnt Gin and Mill Creek camps were designed with the family or organized groups in mind; campers would share the group bunkhouses and dine together in the communal dining halls. Typically these facilities were used by groups such as the Boy Scouts, the YMCA, and in the 1940s, by convalescent soldiers returning from the Second World War.[39]

The state parks in general, and the group camps specifically, were meant to meet the recreation needs of the local residents, the poor and handicapped, and those from rural areas. While Poinsett did meet the criteria of providing opportunities for inexpensive recreation, it was accessible only to whites because of the legal segregation of the 1930s South. This is particularly ironic when one considers that the local population of the Manchester area was predominantly black and poor, and as a result could not gain access to the new idealistic park landscape. As a compromise, the CCC constructed Mill Creek group camp as a state park for local blacks; however, the material nature of Mill Creek park reflected the social inequality between the races. While Mill Creek contained the same number and type of facilities as Burnt Gin (built for whites), these structures were markedly inferior to those built by the CCC in Poinsett.[40] Similarly, the small size of Mill Creek in comparison to Poinsett emphasized the same social inequality. Though some New Deal planners sought to improve the lives of African-Americans, they rarely tried to change the entrenched southern racial caste system.[41] As a result, though the new public landscape of Manchester included many improvements for local blacks, one of its most noticeable aspects must have been its segregated design.

The second component of the Manchester land reform project, the resettlement community at Tiverton Farms, was, and still is, in complete contrast to the state park's landscape of recreation. Tiverton Farms was a New Deal resettlement community designed to help the poorest tenant farmers who lived within the overall project area by providing them with new farms and the best quality land in the area. It appears that the community was envisioned as being part of the project from the very beginning, though construction work did not begin until 1939. Tiverton Farms was administered by a number of federal agencies, first by the Rural Rehabilitation Division of FERA, and then the Resettlement Administration

from 1935-1937. The bulk of the resettlement and actual construction of the farms was done by the FSA between 1939 and 1941. Materially, the project consisted of approximately two-thousand acres of the most productive farmland in Manchester, divided into twenty-nine small subsistence farms. The government, through the FSA, constructed on each farm a five room house, a barn, chicken house, smokehouse, outhouse, and well, with each farm valued at approximately four-thousand dollars. By 1940, the FSA selected a number of the local black tenant families to lease and eventually own the farms.[42]

The material remains of Tiverton Farms document the intentions and results of the most radical of the land reform efforts: resettlement. The farm buildings themselves are an interesting mixture of pre-1935 cotton farming traditions with the communal and reform ideals of the Resettlement Administration. To begin with, a list of the FSA structures on each farm unit reads almost exactly like a list of buildings on the typical tenant farm before 1935: farmhouse, chicken house, smokehouse, and barn. Planners expected farmers to still grow cotton, and that farming would be done traditionally, not with tractors, but with mules.[43] However, central to the Resettlement Administration's reform ideology was the idea that life would be better after the New Deal. In short, reform meant that not only were the new farm buildings designed to be cleaner, larger, and more comfortable, they were also designed to be owned by the family, not rented in a form of permanent semi-servitude. Land ownership, with its connotations of freedom and independence, was a radical new opportunity for many of the black tenant farmers in Manchester. In keeping with the hopes of the land reform planners, many of the original families did buy the farms in 1945, and they, or their children, still occupy the farms and the remaining farmhouses today. For instance, James Washington, a second generation FSA client, bought his government farmhouse in 1951, and improved it by replacing the original clapboard siding with bricks. He also inherited his father's FSA house, and the family retains ownership of the two extant buildings today. Similarly, Pasture Road, at Tiverton Farms, is a reminder of the communal ideals of the project. This road was named after the three-hundred acre communal cow pasture located in the northwest section of the community, that was owned collectively and shared by all the farm families living on the project.[44]

The Resettlement Administration planners were well aware of the social meaning of farm ownership and cooperative self-sufficiency, and certainly the farms that they designed reflect this attempt to bring part of the American dream to southern tenant farmers. To begin with, the farms in the Tiverton community were from forty to seventy acres in size, larger than what was necessary for simple subsistence and big enough to produce enough of a variety of cash crops to bring in additional income. Between 1940 and 1945, farmers on the Tiverton plots grew a variety of crops, ranging from cotton to peanuts to corn, reflecting the hope that crop diversity could bring greater independence. The farm houses themselves, though cheaply and hurriedly constructed, were an improvement over the previous tenant housing. Not only were they larger in size, but they also had electric wiring, enclosed ceilings, and sound roofs. The designers addressed sanitary concerns by including screens on the doors and windows, and effective exterior siding that kept out insects, animals, and the elements.[45] Taken together, these material and social improvements at Tiverton Farms must have added positive meaning to the new landscape of Manchester. This idea is supported by a 1979 study of 178 black resettlement clients which found that FSA farm ownership did result in long term social, economic, and emotional benefits for black farmers in particular. Many of the FSA clients who were interviewed in the 1979 study stated that farm ownership gave them feelings of independence and security. This independence often increased their social standing in the community and allowed them to become more involved in the political process, especially during the civil rights era.[46]

The new landscape of the forest demonstration area, created between 1934 and 1956, had the greatest effect on the material landscape of Manchester.[47] The scale of this third component of the land

reform project, which radically altered thirty thousand acres of farm land, testifies to the commitment of the land reformers to finding new productive uses for the land and opportunities for work relief for local residents. In this case, timber was meant to produce jobs and products that could provide economic security for local residents. To reach this goal, forest workers, under the guidance of the Resettlement Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Works Progress Administration, transformed cotton plantations into pine plantations, and farm roads into firebreaks.

As a result, the scrub oak forests were rapidly replaced with timber that grew quickly and could be turned into pulpwood, milled lumber, posts and poles--anything that had commercial value. During the forties, slash pine was planted the most frequently, because it was a species that grew quickly. This in itself was a significant change, since the Sandhills were more typically an area where longleaf pine, rather than slash pine, thrived. In 1940 alone, the farm families, working for wages paid by the state, planted two thousand acres of slash and longleaf pine. By 1945 the number of plantings rose to 131,000 seedlings planted per year, with a maximum of over half a million planted in the 1948-49 fiscal year.[48] The few 1930s-40s slash pine plantations that remain today in Manchester are reminders that quick growth of timber was required in order to ensure a quick commercial return; in this manner, the unmanaged forest/waste areas of the cotton farm landscape were replaced by efficient and scientifically managed timber resources.

Additionally, forest managers desired to protect the government's investment in timber from fire. This required that all fires be suppressed. The removal of fire from the Manchester forest resulted in a change in forest composition, as it allowed slash and loblolly pines to successfully replace the more fire tolerant species of longleaf pine and turkey oak. Additionally, the South Carolina Forestry Commission, which acquired the area in 1939, took steps to eliminate the larger scrub oak and undesirable hardwoods in 1948 by using poison (ammonium sulfamate crystals), since those trees created competition which interfered with the growth of the pines.[49] Active management of timber, which changed the ecology and appearance of Manchester, was probably the single most dominant historical influence on the material aspects of the local landscape after 1934.

Many of the farmers who had previously tilled the land behind a mule now planted pine seedlings by the thousands throughout the project, the men using a "dibble" to dig the holes, and the women following along behind carrying the buckets of seedlings.[50] Significantly, the forest provided African American farmers with work that was not available to them in the local CCC crews. Unlike the FSA, the CCC was reluctant to employ blacks on highly visible projects.[51] Specifically, CCC crews made up of white workers did the bulk of the construction of Poinsett State Park. Similarly, white building contractors constructed Tiverton Farms. While blacks might be hired to clear land, build dams, pour foundations, or plant trees, the higher profile work was reserved for whites. The one black CCC crew sent to work at Poinsett State Park was soon sent elsewhere due to complaints made by local whites in the county.[52] Thus it was local black farmers, rather than the CCC who created the reform landscape of the New Deal forest in Manchester. The forest they planted, which brought in substantial income, was in direct contrast to the unmanaged waste and forest land of the cotton farming landscape, which was of little value to the local farmers. For example, Hopkins Washington, a tenant farmer, earned $360.00 working on the forest between January 1936 and September 1937.[53] The family surveys of 1937 document the importance of this work relief income for almost all of the Manchester residents; often it was government relief wages that carried local families through the Depression years.

The enormous numbers of firebreaks are another reminder of this original purpose of the forestry demonstration area, which was the relief employment of poor, out of work farmers who were no longer able to support themselves on sub-marginal land. In order to protect the new pine plantations, forest project workers built hundreds of miles of firebreaks, which added to the already extensive pre-1935

network or roads, and manned a fire lookout tower in the center of the project area. The synergistic effect of the systems of old roads and the new network of firebreaks is apparent today almost any where in the Manchester woods, where swathes of open land cut through the woods at regular intervals. In 1940 one hundred and ten miles of fire breaks had been cut into the forest, in addition to sixty-five miles of truck trails and twenty miles of sand or clay roads. In many ways, though used differently, the old roads and the new firebreaks served similar purposes; both were tools used in a type of agriculture that provided the lifeblood for the local economy. However, the cotton farming roads looked back to the traditions of farm tenancy and plantation work, while the firebreaks predicted a new system in which farmers could enjoy greater economic security and independence.[54]

An examination of the Manchester landscape suggests that certain local conditions may have made New Deal reforms more meaningful and effective in certain places. Material and social inequalities inherent in the cotton farming system of the southern "black belt" probably caused land reform to be more attractive for residents of that area. For example, Donald Holley has argued that, for southern black Americans in particular, the lasting achievement of the New Deal land reform projects was the sense of hope they created in the minds of a group of people who were unaccustomed to hoping.[55] Similarly, Harvard Sitkoff asserted that despite its weaknesses, the "reform spirit of the New Deal helped create a psychological climate in which black southerners and their allies could struggle with expectations of success."[56] The resettlement community at Manchester may have done just this as it provided residents with opportunities for better lives, as well as a chance for independence gained from land ownership. Similarly, the forestry demonstration area at least helped local families survive the hard times of the Depression: it may have also given hope as it attempted to rearrange a system characterized by an unequal division of labor and material culture. Though the New Deal did not have the goal of eliminating racism, as evidenced by the segregated design of Poinsett State Park, it did attempt to bring hope to a group of the poorest of Americans, the black tenant farmers and laborers of Manchester, South Carolina.

Though the Manchester project affected only a small number of people, and transformed only 30,000 acres, it was more representative of the southern experience than one might think. During the 1930s, New Deal land reform agencies carried out similar projects across South Carolina and the South. The Resettlement Administration, the State Forestry Commission, and the National Park Service implemented identical programs in northeastern South Carolina at the Sandhills State Forest and Cheraw State Park. Similarly, the U.S. Forest Service restored worn-out piedmont farm land and rehabilitated numerous tenant farm houses on the Sumter National Forest. Altogether, federal and state agencies acquired, and radically transformed, over 730,000 acres of land in South Carolina between 1934 and 1945.[57] The thousands of local residents living on or adjacent to these areas clearly experienced dramatic changes, some of which had beneficial results. Historians have asserted that the FSA and other resettlement agencies failed to mitigate the harmful effects of the AAA's crop reduction program, helping only a small minority of rural southerners. However, in making this claim they have failed to document the connections between the work of the FSA and other land reform and conservation agencies. As can be seen from the case of Manchester, the resettlement program was part of a complex, and coordinated, web of complimentary land reform efforts.

ENDNOTES

[1] Pete Daniel, Breaking the Land: The Transformation of Cotton, Tobacco, and Rice Cultures Since 1880 (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1985), 91-109, 168-183, 291-293; Peter Daniel, "The

New Deal, Southern Agriculture, and Economic Change," in James Cobb and Michael V. Namorato, eds., The New Deal and the South (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1984), 41-42, 45-61; Jack Temple Kirby, Rural Worlds Lost: The American South, 1920-1960 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1987), xiv-xv, 60-65; Roger Biles, A New Deal for the American People (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1991), 66-68; Roger Biles, The South and the New Deal (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1994), 48-50.

[2] Daniel, "The New Deal, Southern Agriculture, and Economic Change," in Cobb et al, 41.

[3] Harvard Sitkoff, "The Impact of the New Deal on Black Southerners," in James Cobb and Michael V. Namorato, eds., The New Deal and the South (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1984), 127.

[4] William E. Leuchtenburg, The FDR Years: On Roosevelt and His Legacy (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 273; Lester M. Salamond, • The Future of Black Land in the South,• in The Black Rural Landowner--Endangered Species: Social, Political, and Economic Implications, eds. Leo McGee and Robert Boone (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1979), 167-185

[5] Biles, The South and the New Deal, 103-124; Harvard Sitkoff, A New Deal for Blacks: The Emergence of Civil Rights as a National Issue (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 73.

[6] Corn, planted in substantial quantities, provided feed for livestock, some foodstuffs, and possibly additional cash income from corn whiskey. However, the local farming system was based primarily on cotton. Land Appraisal Reports, Historical Files 1934-56, Records of Manchester State Forest, Forest Headquarters, Wedgefield, South Carolina. Materials from this collection will hereafter be referred to as the Historical Files.

[7] United States Census Bureau, Manuscript Census for Manchester and Middleton Townships, Sumter County, South Carolina, 1920; Family Surveys, 1937, Historical Files; Land Appraisal Reports, Historical Files.

[8] Manuscript Census for Manchester and Middleton Townships, 1920.

[9] Paul E. Mertz, New Deal Policy and Southern Rural Poverty (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1978), 5.

[10] Family Survey of Robert Kelly, Historical Files. For a description of differences between cash renting, share renting, and sharecropping, see: Charles Orser, Jr., The Material Basis of the Postbellum Tenant Plantation: Historical Archaeology in the South Carolina Piedmont (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988), 58-60; and Mertz, New Deal Policy and Southern Rural Poverty, 6-7.

[11] The Manuscript Census for Manchester and Middleton Townships, 1920, listed several white residents, living on or near Tiverton Plantation, whose occupation was recorded as • farm manager, overseer." Most likely, these men supervised crews of laborers on the old plantation tracts. For a description of the wage-labor and gang system of postbellum farming see Orser, Material Basis, 48-53 and Arthur F. Raper, Preface to Peasantry, A Tale of Two Black Belt Counties (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1936), 152-156.

[12] Family Survey for Robert Medlin, Historical Files.

[13] Land Appraisal Report for Tract 101a, Historical Files.

[14] The following maps provide a composite view of the roads of the cotton farming landscape: Land Appraisal Reports, 1935, Historical Files; United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Map of Sumter County, 1935; Aerial Photographs of Western Sumter County, 1937, Records of Manchester State Forest, Forest Headquarters, Wedgefield, South Carolina. Wade Reynolds indicated that the Old King• s Highway, today• s River Road in Manchester, was created before the American Revolutionary War. Wade • Buster• Reynolds, Interview by Author, 4 October 1996.

[15] Levi was the absentee owner of tract 4, and much of the area from which Poinsett State Park was made. Geddings owned much of the old Tiverton Plantation. Land Appraisal Reports, Historical Files. For a discussion of the different uses of paths and roads, see Raper, Preface to Peasantry, 397.

[16] Jerry Walker, Interview by Author, 24 October 1996.

[17] Prior to 1934, in Greene County, Georgia, an area similar to Manchester, one half to two thirds of the woodlands were burned in this manner each year. Arthur Raper, Tenants of the Almighty (New York: MacMillan Company, 1943), 222-223. For a discussion of Sandhills ecology and vegetation see Janine M. Benyus, The Field Guide to Wildlife Habitats of the Eastern United States (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1989), 289-91.

[18] Walker, Interview by Author; Land Appraisal Report for Tract 5c, Historical Files.

[19] Raper, Preface to Peasantry, 61-68.

[20] Marvin C. Burress, Sr., Interview by Author, 24 October 1996; Reynolds, Interview by Author; Land Appraisal Report for Tract 101b. At least three rural stores served the Manchester area prior to 1935: The Burress store in Wedgefield, the Robert Barwick Store on the River Road at Bloomhill, and the plantation commissary on tract 101b Raper described rural stores as • biracial institutions• where tenants, black landowners, laborers, merchants, and landlords interacted. Raper, Preface to Peasantry, 275-276.

[21] Four rural schools existed in Manchester in 1935: Harvin, Manchester, Orangehill, and Bloomhill schools. United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Map, 1935.

[22] Walker, Interview by Author; United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Map, 1935; Reynolds, Interview by Author.

[23] Paul K. Conkin, Tomorrow a New World: The New Deal Community Program (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1959) 77-81. Sidney Baldwin, Poverty and Politics: The Rise and Decline of the Farm Security Administration (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1968), 65-66; Raper, Tenants of the Almighty, 219.

[24] Conkin, Tomorrow a New World, 84-86; Baldwin, Poverty and Politics, 36-37; Rexford G. Tugwell, • The Resettlement Idea,• Agricultural History 33 (October 1959): 159-164.

[25] Linda Flint McClelland, Presenting Nature: The Historic Landscape Design of the National Park Service, 1916-1942 (N.P.: National Park Service, 1993), 229-234; Phoebe Cutler, The Public Landscape of the New Deal (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 64-66, 70-75.

[26] Land Appraisal Reports, Historical Files; • Data for Monthly Progress Reports• File, 20 August 1940, Historical Files.

[27] Stephen W. Skelton, • Poinsett State Park: National Register Nomination Preliminary Research,• 1989, Unpublished Report, Poinsett State Park Files, Wedgefield, South Carolina, 3, 11-12.

[28] • Data for Monthly Progress Reports• File, 1940, Historical Files; • Narrative Report of the Poinsett State Forest for Fiscal Year 1944-45,• 6 September 1945, Historical Files.

[29] Phoebe Cutler, Public Landscape, 4.

[30] The chronology of the change in agencies in charge is documented by the paperwork letterheads from the project. See Land Appraisal Reports, 1935; Family Surveys, 1937; and • Land Acquisition Plan Poinsett Development, LD-SC-5, April 13, 1939,• all in Historical Files.

[31] Family Surveys, Historical Files; • Annual Report, 1948-49,• Historical Files. For the *modus operandi* of the agencies for relocating residents see the following, all in Historical Files: W.L. Lee to Robert Medlin, 1 March 1938, Historical Files; • Memorandum of Agreement Between the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Farm Security Administration for Relocation of Families Occupying Farms Acquired in Land Utilization Projects• ; and annual reports of the project, 1938-57.

[32] See • Data for Monthly Progress Reports, 1940,• • Narrative Report of the Poinsett State Forest, 1944-45,• and • Annual Report, 1956-57,• all in Historical Files.

[33] Richard Irvine Manning's former residence, which currently serves as the Forest manager's house, is the only exception to this.

[34] Skelton, • Poinsett State Park,• 11-12; Stephen Lewis Cox, • The History of Negro State Parks in South Carolina, 1940-1963,• MA Thesis (University of South Carolina, 1992), 18.

[35] Cutler, Public Landscape, 77-81, 90-92.

[36] For a description of the concept of • landscape naturalization• see McClelland, Presenting Nature, 149-156.

[37] • Poinsett SP-3 Incinerators Base Plan,• 31 August 1935, and • Poinsett SP-3 Landscape Plan for Bathhouse Area,• 20 September 1935, Poinsett State Park Map and Blueprint Collection, Wedgefield, South Carolina.

[38] Poinsett State Park Jobs, Box 19, Civilian Conservation Corps Files, Records of the South Carolina Forestry Commission, State Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina.

[39] Cutler, Public Landscape, 70-75; • Annual Report 1956-57,• and • Narrative Report of the Poinsett State Forest,• 1945, Historical Files.

[40] Cutler, Public Landscape, 70-75; Cox, • The History of Negro State Parks,• 5, 19-22.

[41] Biles, The South and the New Deal, 103.

[42] • Homesteads Report, 1 March 1940,• Occupancy Files, Records of Region 5 of the Resettlement Administration, Records of the Farmers Home Administration, RG#96, National Archives and Records Administration, Atlanta, Georgia; Walker, Interview by Author.• Data for Monthly Progress Reports, 1940,• Historical Files; Conkin, Tomorrow a New World, 337; William D. Hiott, • New Deal Resettlement in South Carolina,• MA Thesis (University of South Carolina, 1986), 7; E.S. Morgan, Letter to J.H. Wood, 25 March 1940, Occupancy File, Records of Region 5.

[43] Walker, Interview by Author.

[44] On ownership of the farms, see Tiverton Farms Plat, Z7-044, 7 July 1947, Office of Mesne Conveyances, Sumter County Courthouse, Sumter, South Carolina; Walker, Interview by Author; James Washington, Interview by Author, 26 October 1996. Mr. Washington is a second generation client of the FSA at Tiverton Farms. He also worked as a park ranger at Poinsett State Park from 1942-81. On Cooperation, see Tugwell, • The Resettlement Idea• ; Walker, Interview by Author; Washington, Interview by Author.

[45] Tiverton Farms Plat Z7-044; Walker, Interview by Author; Raper, Tenants of the Almighty, 269.

[46] Lester M. Salamond, • The Future of Black Land in the South,• in The Black Rural Landowner--Endangered Species: Social, Political, and Economic Implications, eds. Leo McGee and Robert Boone (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1979), 167-185; Biles, The South and the New Deal, 103-124; Sitkoff, A New Deal for Blacks, 73.

[47] The forest demonstration area actually went through a number of name changes: Poinsett Forest Demonstration Area (1935-39), Poinsett State Forest (1939-56), and Manchester State Forest (1956 to the present). For convenience I refer to it in this paper simply as the forestry demonstration area.

[48] • Data for Monthly Progress Reports• ; • Narrative Report of the Poinsett State Forest, 1944-45• ; • Annual Report, 1948-49," all in Historical Files. Other species planted by the Forestry Commission between 1939 and 1949 included: black walnut, white ash, black locust, southern white cedar, loblolly pine, and • spruce• pine.

[49] • Annual Report, 1948-49,• Historical Files.

[50] Walker, Interview by Author.

[51] Biles, The South and the New Deal, 112-113, 117; Sitkoff, "The Impact of the New Deal on Black Southerners," in Cobb et al, 123-124.

[52] Skelton, • Poinsett State Park,• 16.

[53] Family Survey for Hopkins Washington, 1937, Historical Files.

[54] • Narrative Report of the Poinsett State Forest, 1944-45,• Historical Files. Firebreaks were designed to block the progress of fire with open areas that denied the approaching fire any fuel.

[55] Donald Holley, • The Negro in the New Deal Resettlement Program,• Agricultural History 45 (July 1941): 179-200.

[56] Harvard Sitkoff, "The Impact of the New Deal On Black Southerners," 133.

[57] Christian L. Larsen, South Carolina's Natural Resources: A Study in Public Administration (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1947), 18-22, 28-32.

The Charleston Orphan House: The First One Hundred Years

On October 18, 1790 at the instigation of John Robertson, a philanthropic merchant and member of City Council, an Ordinance was passed establishing the Charleston Orphan House "for the purpose of supporting and educating poor and orphan children and those of poor and disabled parents who are unable to support and maintain them." [1] Until the building was demolished in 1952, over five thousand needy white children were cared for by the Institution. Charlestonians were proud of their Orphan House, the first municipal child care facility in the United States. It was believed that "strangers have missed what is best with us, if they have not visited the Orphan House."[2] This paper will discuss the history of the building and the management of the facility including religious institutions, the medical department, finances, staffing and the education of the children. The Orphan House's philosophy of child care and its place in Charleston society will also be discussed.

Prior to the establishment of the Orphan House, indigent adults and children received similar treatment. Assistance to the poor was primarily governed by the "vestries of the several parishes [who] were empowered yearly to nominate two or more overseers, who with the wardens of the parishes, were charged with the ordering and relieving of the poor, out of such money and fines as should be given for their use, which, if not sufficient was to be supplied by assessment, which the vestries were authorized to make.[3] An Act, [P. L. 263], passed on April 12, 1768, charged "the Commissioners of the Exchange and Custom House to erect a Poor House on the four acres of ground belonging to the City, on which the Work House and Brick Barracks stood"[4] [now the site of the Robert Mills Manor Housing Project]. The Poor House benefited two types of individuals -- those admitted to the Institution and those who received daily stipulated quantities of food called rations. John Robertson believed that this method of assistance only introduced children to the worst elements of society by housing them with vagrants, thieves and other poor role models. He stated that children should be taught industrious habits so that they could become productive, useful and most importantly, tax paying adults. [5]

City Council annually elected twelve Commissioners who were responsible for the management and operation of the Orphan House. It was considered an honor to be asked to serve on this Board. Many familiar Charleston names including Ravenel, Middleton, Aiken, DeSaussure, Huger, Ladson, Rutledge and Lowndes can be found on the list of Commissioners. This Board met weekly with each member alternating his services as a Visiting Commissioner. The Visiting Commissioner primarily investigated applicants for admission or indenture; however, he also inspected the House, grounds and staff and conducted religious services on Sunday afternoon in the Orphan House Chapel. Nine standing committees were appointed by the Commissioners to oversee the operation of the Institution: a Committee on Improvement and Discipline, a Committee on Chapel and Anniversary, a Committee on Schools, a Committee on Accounts, a Committee on Binding Out, a Committee on Repairs, a Committee on Purveyance and Supervision, a Committee on Binding Out, and a Committee on Retrenchment.[6]

The Charleston Orphan House stood at the corner of Calhoun and St. Philip Streets. Built on the site of Revolutionary War Barracks, the Institution was officially occupied October 18, 1794.[7] Designed by Thomas Bennett, the building was described as having a "center 40 x 40, the wings 65 by 30 feet each. The foundation to the first floor, to the top of the floor 2 feet high, 3 bricks thick. The first story 10 feet high, 2 bricks. The second Story 15 feet high, 2 bricks. Third story 13 feet, 2 bricks. And the Fourth Story 10 feet high, 2 bricks." [8] The Commissioners directed that "the South Front should be 250 feet

from Boundary [now Calhoun] Street, 24 feet Northward of the House to be Inclosed as yard, and the remainder a kitchen garden, the South front to be laid out in walks to be determined by the Commissioners." [9] Anthony Toomer performed the brickwork duties and the firm of Cannon and Bennett did the carpentry work.[10]

Citizens raised money for the completion of the building in many ways. Legislators Thomas Middleton and John Blake gave their annual salaries.[11] The Carpenters' Society donated twenty-five pounds.[12] Perhaps the most unusual gift was that of Ralph Izard who "presented...16 Turkies and 16 Geese."[13] The majority of the private funds; however, came from Charity Sermons preached by local clergy.

In 1853, due to the increasing numbers of children being cared for by the Institution, the building was completely remodeled. Designed by the firm of Jones and Lee,[14] the building was described as being

> in the Italian style...236 feet long by 76 feet wide. The main building is five stories high, including the attic. The front is divided into three sections, the central portion being surmounted by a pediment and with an Italian portico projecting in front. This portico consists of Corinthian pillars, between which are arches supporting wings rising the whole height of the building, perforated on the several stories by windows with characteristic embellishments. The building is surmounted by a Mansard roof, the attic windows projecting from the first slope of the roof, with moulded pediments. Above the roof of the central section of the front rises the belfry, constructed for the City alarm bell. This belfry is supported by an octagonal stage, in the centre of which arises the main cupola... in which is suspended the alarm bell. This stage is surmounted by a square dome, which supports a figure of Charity.[15]

Other local companies who worked on the renovation were Louis Rebb, contractor and carpenter; G. W. Busby, bricklayer; W. H. Gruver, plasterer; W. T. White; stonecutter; W. S. Henerey, cast iron work; Horton and Park, tinner and plumber; T. Newal, gas fitter; J. U. Boesch, coppersmith; Wm. Arnot, painter; James Cook, steam fitter; J. M. Eason & Bro, engine maker; R. Wing, bell hanger and J. M. Mulvany, slater.[16]

Until 1802 the children attended area churches in rotation. This practice was unsatisfactory to the Commissioners and in 1801 the cornerstone was laid for the Orphan House Chapel. Although Gabriel Manigault is generally credited with the design of the building, there is no mention in the records of the architect. The Chapel was "erected by voluntary benevolence of the citizens and no public money was used."[17] Nondenominational clergymen of various faiths staffed the Chapel. A cemetery for children and staff of the Institution was placed next to the Chapel. This area continued to be used for burials until 1855 when six lots were purchased at Magnolia Cemetery. [18]

Religious education played an important role in the life of the Institution. The children said prayers morning and evening and the Commissioners rigorously investigated the religious tenets of prospective masters. Although the Commissioners placed great emphasis on theology, it was definitely Protestant. In 1857 Rabbi Meyer of the Hasell Street Synagogue requested that two Jewish children, Henrietta and Benjamin Leman, be allowed to worship on Saturday or to be instructed in the Hebrew faith.[19] The Commissioners refused because "the regulation of the House would be so materially interfered with."[20] Perhaps the most vehement protests came from John, Bishop of Charleston, who objected to Roman Catholic children being "taught the Catechism of a Society which protests the religion of their parents as erroneous."[21] After he was informed that Catholic priests would be allowed to conduct services in the Chapel in rotation with other clergy, Bishop England declared "that poverty shall not deprive its victim of

religious rights."[22] It is interesting to note that despite this compromise, the name of a Catholic priest never appeared on the rotation schedules.

Children, or inmates as they were known, were admitted to the Orphan House by a church or city warden, parent or guardian. After an investigation by the Visiting Commissioner, full orphans, fatherless or motherless children and even children with two living parents were admitted and "bound" to the Institution. The apprenticeship was a legal and binding document whereby the parent or guardian relinquished all rights to the child. To insure that the taxpayers of Charleston did not pay for the care of other municipalities' children, the Commissioners enforced a residency requirement.[23] Over the years, the period ranged from one to three years of documented residence within the city.

Girls were bound to the Orphan House until age eighteen and boys until age twenty-one; however, the Commissioners retained the power to transfer the indentures to another Master at a later date. The power to indenture children was affirmed in the case of Welborn vs. Little, 1 Nott and McCord 265, which stated "in case any poor Children shall be chargeable to the respective districts, it shall and may be lawful for the Commissioners of such district to bind any child or children."[24] A Master agreed to

> teach and instruct or otherwise cause to be well and sufficiently instructed, after the best way and manner that he can, and shall and will also find and allow the said apprentice, meat, drink, washing, lodging and apparel, both linen and woolen, and all other necessaries in sickness and in health...and at the expiration of the said term, shall and will give unto---said apprentice (over and above all other clothing) one new suit of apparel, and stockings, with suitable linen, as fit and usual for such an apprentice."[25]

Boys were apprenticed at about age fourteen and girls at about age thirteen. Several times a year, the Commissioners prepared a Binding-Out List of suitable children for prospective Masters to study. Officers, particularly the teachers and Principal of the School, submitted reports on the children detailing ages, years and class in school, etc. Also included were remarks. One boy was described as a "Good Boy; has exerted a good influence in the School. Would like to be a machinist or Clerk in a Grocery...[Another was] a dull boy; but not vicious, Mother living, who said she hoped to get him employment with a Gas Fitter...[The Officers called one girl] a good seamstress. Would like to go to Mr. J. M. Caldwell...[A less promising female was] dull and untidy. Wishes to be a seamstress."[26]

The Commissioners scrupulously investigated the prospective Master, requiring letters of reference and often requesting recommendations from acquaintances or former inmates. After a child was bound, the Master was asked to report annually on the progress, health and general deportment of his charge; however, only a small percentage ever complied. The vast majority of letters received by the Commissioners contained complaints from apprentices regarding the treatment they had received. It is to the credit of the Commissioners that they did attempt to discover the truth about the situation. If it could be proven that the Master was at fault, the child was returned to the Institution.

Opportunities differed for males and females. Boys were indentured to dozens of different trades; however, girls were bound only as domestics, seamstresses, milliners or mantuamakers (a type of feminine cloak). Exceptions to these occupations were rare. Seven girls were bound as spinners and weavers and one girl was apprenticed as a merchant. The most unusual opportunity for girls occurred in 1848 when three female inmates were sent to Graniteville, South Carolina as cotton manufacturers. This experiment ended in 1849 due to the ill-health of the woman housing the girls.[27]

It is interesting to note that less than ten years later, the Committee on Indentures voiced strong opposition to any inmate being apprenticed to a manufacturer. The Committee reported that the employment was not healthy and presented no prospect of future advancement in life. As the inmates

received a good education, they were better qualified for "other employment." In addition, the Committee preferred to indenture children to individuals rather than to companies.[28]

In her book, Benevolence Among Slaveholders, Barbara Bellows explained that "the ancient system of apprenticeship flourished in southern cities that offered little else in public education...In the North, innovations in mass production and infusions of cheap foreign labor made apprenticeship almost obsolete."[29] During the Civil War, most of the children who left the Institution were returned to relatives. After the War, the numbers of apprenticed children never again reached those of earlier years. The majority remained in the Institution until their middle teens, when they left to seek employment on their own or were returned to their families.

Included in the care provided by the Institution was a medical department. The Commissioners believed that "regular hours, good ventilation, exercise and wholesome, well prepared food contribute largely to the health of the children."[30] In 1807 City Council ratified an Ordinance authorizing "that the Physician of the Orphan House shall and do attend on, and administer medicines to all sick persons in the said institution, whether such persons be maintained and relieved in the same, or whether they be employed therein as officers, assistants or servants."[31] During the nineteenth century, only two physicians served the Institution. Dr. George Logan (1778-1861) employed from 1810-1854 and Dr. William H. Huger (1826-1906) employed from 1854-1906.

It is to be expected in an Institution housing hundreds of young children that disease would be common. What is unusual is the small percentage of disease related deaths. Between 1822 and 1848, no more than six children died in a year. At this time, the population of the Orphan House ranged from a high of 200 (including staff and slaves) in 1825[32] to a low of 117 in 1846.[33] According to the Census of the City of Charleston, 1848, there were 8,699 white births in the city between 1822 and 1848. Of these, 2031 or over twenty-three per cent died before age ten.[34]

With so many bodies confined in a single building, the threat of epidemics constantly loomed over the Institution. One can almost hear the resignation in his voice when Dr. Huger reported "there is a case of measles in the House."[35] Other diseases that frequently struck the Institution included Ophthalmia, digestive and bowel disorders, scarlet fever, broken bone fever (a mild form of yellow fever), catarrh (influenza), whooping cough, mumps and bilious fevers. The "disgusting disease...the so detestable a Disorder, the Itch"[36] appeared so frequently that Dr. Logan lamented "I am positively assured [inmates] seek to become affected!"[37]

Perhaps the most feared disease was small pox. Although epidemics of the disease struck the city of Charleston with regularity, the isolation of the Orphan House protected it. The most important contribution made by Dr. Logan to the health of the Institution was his enthusiastic support of vaccination. The first children were inoculated in March 1811.[38] By 1854 Dr. Logan had established a weekly vaccination schedule, inoculating new admissions every Friday.[39] Praising the medical department in 1862, the Commissioners declared that

> when we look back upon and call to mind the sources from whence its youthful inmates have been derived; the poverty and impoverishment under which their organization have grown and their consciousness initially informed; and the consequent proclivities to disease and familiar death, which these are known to engender, the wonderment should be not that we have suffered...but that they have enjoyed so signal an immunity.[40]

Financial support for the Orphan House came from both public and private sources. City Council made annual appropriations and state law permitted the Orphan House to share in funds collected from

escheated property.[41] Philanthropic citizens often made liberal donations and bequests. Mordecai Cohen, a prominent Jewish merchant and Commissioner, annually provided Christmas dinner for the children. A Private Fund, established in September 1808, was used for "donations given directly to the Board of Commissioners for the personal comfort and private benefit of the children."[42] Invested in stocks and bonds (not always wisely), the interest paid for girls' dowries when they married, expenses accrued by boys away at school or to pay teachers and buy supplies for the schoolrooms. Other gifts were food, fuel, land or bolts of cloth. Much of the Private Fund was lost during the Civil War - the Commissioners had invested heavily in Confederate bonds. It was many years before the Orphan House finances returned to their former status.

The Commissioners, with employment and families outside the Orphan House, could not manage the Institution without assistance; so a staff known as Officers was annually elected to fill various posts. A Steward was in charge of the overall operation of the Orphan House. Included in his duties were ordering and distributing supplies, supervising the staff, recording the Minutes of the Commissioners' meetings and conducting daily religious training. A Matron supervised the food preparation, sewing room activities and washing. Nurses were responsible for the day-to-day supervision of the children. Each Nurse was in charge of a dormitory of boys or girls of similar ages. A Sewing Mistress taught the older girls to made clothing, blankets, sheets, etc.[43] Other Officers included (at various times) a baker, cook, engineer, gardener, porter, spinner/weaver and washer. Most of the Officers either lived in the Orphan House building or inside the enclosure in small cottages. Until the 1860s, each Officer was allowed rations for himself and his family who also resided in the House.

The education of the children was an integral part of the Orphan House's operation. Educating the poor white class of Charleston was a novel concept in 1790. It was not until the 1850s that "universal education" was available to the working poor of Charleston; however, teachers were employed in the Orphan House from its inception. Children were segregated by sex and placed in classes according to their abilities. Although better than no education at all, these classes consisted of little more than basic reading and arithmetic until the 1850s. It was not unusual for a child to be unable to sign his name when apprenticed to a trade.

Through the efforts of Christopher Gustavus Memminger, a former inmate, the education system of the Institution was completely reorganized. Memminger, considered to be the father of the public school system in Charleston, and Washington Jefferson Bennett, a Commissioner, traveled to New York City and were impressed by a young woman named Agnes K. Irving. She was hired on the spot and no event in the history of the Orphan House was more influential. Miss Irving revolutionized the school and soon was appointed Principal. Under her leadership, new courses such as higher mathematics, literature, geography and elocution were taught.[44] The Orphan House holds the distinction of having established the first kindergarten in South Carolina in 1877. A former inmate, Miss Ellen King, taught the kindergarten children from 1877 until her death in 1917.[45]

After the Civil War, economy was necessary in all areas of the Institution. Miss Irving instigated a program of "Pupil Teachers" to reduce the need for full-time teachers. Promising girls were selected to instruct younger children. These female inmates were not paid a salary, thus saving hundreds of dollars a year. Eventually these girls were employed full-time, who in turn, trained other Pupil Teachers. Many of these women spent their entire lives within the walls of the Institution. Dora Sweatman, admitted in 1892 aged six years, was appointed a Pupil Teacher at the age of fifteen. "Miss Dora" later became a full-time teacher, Principal and Superintendent of the Institution. In addition to Miss Dora, two other future Superintendents, Miss Mary LeQuex and Mrs. Elizabeth Payne, were trained by Miss Irving. Although she died in 1910, Miss Irving's philosophy continued through these women.[46]

The start of Civil War did not drastically affect the operation of the Institution. Life continued with little interruption for the Officers and inmates; however, by 1863, the Federal bombardment forced the removal of the children to a safer location. After investigating several sites, the Commissioners accepted the recommendation of Commissioner George Trenholm and chose a former young ladies academy in Orangeburg (now Claflin College). The Orphan House building served as a Confederate hospital until the end of the War. It is ironic that had the children remained in Charleston, they would have suffered much less because Federal troops attacked the area around the Institution's "safe haven." The building suffered little damage and the children returned in the summer of 1865.[47]

The Orphan House functioned as a self-sufficient and isolated entity as much as possible. Girls sewed and washed most of the clothing and linens of the Institution. Boys milked cows and chopped wood. A kitchen garden supplied vegetables. Children rarely left the enclosure and were not permitted to visit family or friends. In 1855 a Commissioner refused to allow a fifteen year old girl to attend a Saturday afternoon family picnic because "it would so materially disrupt the operation of the House."[48] In 1845 a citizen of Charleston wanted to furnish the Orphan House girls with two calico dresses a year. The Commissioners refused this offer because the homespun uniforms that the girls had been wearing for over forty years reminded the children of their places in society and easily identified them to the tax paying citizens of Charleston. This decision was reconsidered and reversed when it was pointed out that few white citizens wore homespun - it was primarily the clothing of slaves.[49]

The Charleston Orphan House was an excellent example of the nineteenth century doctrine of noblesse-oblige: the belief that those more fortunate have an obligation to care for those less fortunate. Children were constantly reminded of their debt to the Commissioners and City Council. At the Centennial Celebration in 1890, a small boy read a speech thanking his benefactors for having

> taught us to value and to practice neatness and cleanliness, those cheap and blessed luxuries of the poor. Destined as are most of us to the rougher labors of life, we would thank you that in our childhood you have surrounded our dwelling with bright flowers and pleasant gardens, to cultivate in us the spirit of a simple refinement.[50]

Children were expected to know their place and to be grateful to those who made their lives better. In 1882 Miss Irving complained that a former inmate, Leonard Baker, failed to write a thank you note for being allowed to attend Vanderbilt University as had others "who were much more grateful for their opportunities."[51] The Commissioners preferred the attitude of Mikell Covert who after graduating from the High School of Charleston in 1846 and the Charleston College in 1853, completed his medical studies in 1855 at the Medical College of South Carolina . After he received his medical degree, Covert thanked the Commissioners.

> Thrown upon the charity of a cold, unfeeling world, I found...there gushed many a warm spring of human sympathy, welling up from hearts of love and pity for the poor Orphan....Let me assure you, that by energy and rectitude, I will never put to blush the fair and benign countenance of my Alma Mater.[52]

After this modest, humble and unassuming speech, Covert requested a monetary gift to assist him in setting up his practice and purchasing equipment. There is no mention as to the Commissioners' reply.[53]

Disrespect and disobedience were not tolerated. The fortunate boys to the High School of Charleston or to college were expected to continue treating the Commissioners with deference and gratitude; however, released for the first time in their lives from strict authority, the boys "pushed the

rules to the limit, refused to obey the staff, began disappearing during chapel services and dared to leave the grounds without permission."[54] The Commissioners reacted to such disrespect with expulsion from the Institution or being bound out as an apprentice to a trade.

Disobedience was punished with even sterner measures. Twelve year old William Newman [Numan] was banished from Charleston forever after he was caught trying to burn down the Orphan House building in 1862. After an investigation of less than three days, the Commissioners placed him aboard a ship bound for ports unknown.[55]

Many distinguished citizens of Charleston lived in the Orphan House as children. Lt. Thomas Gedney, admitted in 1810, discovered a new channel from New York to the Atlantic Ocean. For this accomplishment, Gedney received a valuable silver service and later a Coast Guard vessel was named for him.[56] As previously mentioned, Christopher Gustavus Memminger, Confederate Secretary of the Treasury and founder of the Charleston Public School system, was a former inmate, admitted in 1807.[57] Andrew Buist Murray, admitted in 1856, was a member of City Council and one of Charleston's wealthiest citizens. Murray Park and Murray Boulevard are named for him. During his lifetime, Murray donated hundreds of thousands of dollars for municipal projects and upon his death in 1926 left the Orphan House one hundred thousand dollars.[58] Of course, the majority of the inmates did not achieve such notoriety. Most left the Institution, married, raised families, prospered or failed in business and died. Perhaps this is the Orphan House's true legacy - a greater opportunity for thousands of children to succeed where there had been none before. In 1856 the Rev. Charles C. Pinckney declared

> we see the fatherless running to ruin in our streets, we take them by the hand; we lead them to their designated home; care for their souls; educate their mind, incubate moral and religious principals. We strive to rescue them from the temptations of vice and pollution of the world, and to train them up in the way they should go; trusting that they will not depart therefrom.[59]

It is ironic that in a city justifiably proud of its past, the Charleston Orphan House, the first municipal orphanage in the United States, is virtually unknown. Other famous firsts such as the first golf course, the first museum or the first theater are always mentioned. Less than a decade after the end of the American Revolution, the citizens of Charleston cared enough about poor children to construct and support, at great cost, an orphan house. Does this not say more about our ancestors than they played a round of golf at Harleston Green or saw a play at the Dock Street Theater? The Charleston Orphan House should be accorded its rightful place in the history of Charleston.

END NOTES

1. Minutes of the Board of Commissioners, Charleston Orphan House. October 10, 1790.

2. Centennial Proceedings of the Charleston Orphan House. Charleston: Walker, Evans and Cogswell, 1891., p. 22.

3. Statutes of the State of South Carolina, Vol. II, pp. 593-606 quoted in History of South Carolina Under the Proprietary Government, 1670-1719 by Edward McCrady. New York: MacMillan Company, 1897, p. 515.

4. Yearbook of the City of Charleston, 1880, p. 43.

5. Centennial Proceedings, p. 12.

6. By-Laws of the Charleston Orphan House. Charleston: Evans & Cogswell, 1861., pp. 13-18.

7. Minutes, October 18, 1794.

8. Centennial Proceedings, p. 28.

9. Minutes, May 12, 1792.

10. Ibid.

11. Minutes, November 4, 1792.

12. Minutes, August 9, 1792.

13. Minutes, December 15, 1791.

14. Minutes, December 6, 1792.

15. Centennial Proceedings, p. 78.

16. Ibid., p. 80.

17. Ibid, p. 30.

18. Minutes, September 6, 1855.

19. Minutes, June 18, 1857.

20. Ibid.

21. United States Catholic Miscellany, June 22, 1825, vol. IV, # 25, p. 399. [Archives of the Diocese of Charleston.]
22. Minutes, June 23, 1825.

23. By-Laws, p. 8.

24. 2 Brevard, 129 sec. 29, quoted in Minutes of the Board of Commissioners of the Poor House, December 9, 1840.

25. Indenture Books of the Charleston Orphan House.

26. Committee on Indentures , p. 2.

27. Indenture Book O, pp. 81, 87 and 99.

28. Committee on Indentures, p. 24.

29. Bellows, Barbara. Benevolence Among Slaveholders: Assisting the Poor in Charleston 1670-1860. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993., p. 143.

30 Report of the Committee of Physicians, December 21, 1801 in Medical Matters File.

31. Digest of the Ordinances of the City Council of Charleston From the Year 1783 to October 1844. Charleston: Walker and Burke, 1844., p. 190.

32. Annual Report of the Physician, 1825 in Medical Matters File. (afterwards ARP, date)

33. ARP, 1846.

34. Dawson, J. L., M.D. and DeSaussure, H. W., M.D., Census of the City of Charleston, 1848. Charleston: J. B. Nixon, 1849, p. 223.

35. Doctor's Report, July 1, 1869.

36. Dr. George Logan to the Board of Commissioners, April 11, 1811 in Medical Matters File.

37. Dr. George Logan to the Board of Commissioners, January 17, 1819.

38. ARP, 1811.

39. Dr. George Logan to the Board of Commissioners, January 25, 1854.

40. Minutes, March 4, 1862.

41. Statutes of the State of South Carolina, vol. V, p. 366.

42. Ordinances, pp. 190-191.

43. By-Laws, pp. 19-23.

44. Centennial Proceedings, p. 37.

45. Annual Report of the Commissioners, 1917.

46. Centennial Proceedings, p. 22.
47. Ibid.

48. Application to Admit Richardine Hayes.

49. Committee on Calico Dresses, 1845.

50. Centennial Proceedings, p. 22.

51. Inmates' Files: Leonard Baker

52. Inmates' Files: Mikell Covert

53. Ibid.

54. Bellows, p. 147.

55. Committee on Investigating the Fire, 1862

56. Inmates' Files: Thomas Gedney

57. Indenture Book S, p. 97

58. Will of Andrew Buist Murray - Wills and Legacies Files

59. Anniversary Book - speech of 1856

for additional information see History and Records of the Charleston Orphan House, 1790-1860 and History and Records of the Charleston Orphan House, 1860-1899 by Susan L. King

Francis Lieber at South Carolina Collge, 1835-1856
A Clash of Values

At a time when accountability and political correctness raise concerns regarding academic freedom and the autonomy of institutions of higher learning, it might be pertinent to look back at another time, and note that this is not a phenomenon exclusive to the latter part of the Twentieth Century. To illustrate this point I have chose to look at the tenure of Francis Lieber at South Carolina College from 1835 to 1856, his personal and academic values and their inconsistency with those of a community increasingly seeking to subordinate the college to its purposes.

The early years of the Nineteenth found the people of the state of South Carolina deeply divided along political, societal and religious lines. Religious fundamentalists and Calvinist Presbyterians were challenging the power and influence of the Anglican-Episcopal church, slavery and anti-slavery elements stood in conflict, and the tariffs of 1824 and 1828 had given rise to a nullification movement, which, within a few years, was to form the nucleus of the secessionist effort within the state. There were, of course those, many in powerful positions, who believed that South Carolina's future and interests were best served within the Union and under the Constitution of the United States. However the mood was confrontational and the resort to violence was becoming more frequent.

Dr. Thomas Cooper had assumed the presidency of South Carolina College (as it was then known) in 1821, sixteen years after the institution had opened its doors for to its first class. Dr. Cooper, an Englishman, was a dynamic president who set about the task of broadening and strengthening the curriculum of the young college. As early as 1815, a standing committee of the Board of Trustees had recommended the establishment of a professorship for political economy, "in order to keep pace with the growing knowledge of the world, and to place this Institution on a footing with the great and constantly improving Colleges in the Northern States." Cooper, seizing upon this earlier interest, convinced the trustees in 1823 to establish such a chair and to have himself installed as its professor. Thus, political economy became a part of the curriculum at South Carolina College.

While Cooper's success and impact at the College was not to be denied, his ambitions aimed at larger arenas. He became deeply and personally involved in the factional politics of the state, championing the cause of nullification and serving in the vanguard of the attack against "Calvinist Presbyterianism." His political activities earned both he and the College a considerable number of enemies. Critics launched attacks against him. Following a lengthy investigation by the trustees, and a later trial in which Cooper was vindicated, he tendered his resignation of the presidency on November 27, 1833. The controversy over Cooper had cost the College dearly in terms of enrollment, with only 86 students enrolled in 1833 and dropping to 52 in 1834; the lowest number of students since the College's initial class in 1805.[5]

When the trustees met in November 1834, it was apparent that action needed to be taken. A Resolution was passed as follows:

> Resolved that, in the opinion of the Board of Trustees the present state of the College is such as to require the application of vigorous & immediate measures to restore public confidence. Resolved that, in the opinion of the Board of Trustees the present Faculty are not acceptable to the Community generally, & that the objects of the Institution are, in

> great measure, frustrated by the continuance in office of the present incumbents. Resolved that, in the opinion o the Board of Trustees all the members of the present Faculty should be removed from office, if the Charter Laws allow such removal; and, with the view to an understanding on that subject resolved, that a Committee be raised, to report at the next meeting.[6]

At the December 5, 1834 meeting, the trustees asked for the resignation of the entire faculty[7], and the resignations were received and accepted on December 9th.[8] The December 12th and 17th meetings concerned themselves with the interim administration and operation of the College, with some discussion and consideration given to the possible closing of the institution until a new faculty could be found.[9] By June 1835, a slate of candidates had been assembled, and the trustees selected five new faculty members. Among those selected (receiving twenty-three votes) was Francis Lieber, a German scholar, who had assembled and edited the first, thirteen-volume edition of the Encyclopedia Americana.[10]
The attack which had earlier been focused on Dr. Cooper, was now shifted against the College and the new faculty. Led by such pamphlets as "The Spy"[11], critics continued the attack which was taken up by elements of the popular press. In a series of three articles written under the pseudonym "Civis" in the Camden Journal and Southern Whig, the new faculty and particularly Francis Lieber, were attacked on religious, political and regional grounds. Critics accused Lieber of being an abolitionist, and the question raised as to the new faculty's religious convictions.[12] They noted

> A...We might entertain the hope that while a young man saw the religion of his fathers sustained by his preceptors, men of learning and of intellect, he would be preserved from vacillation and apostasy.[13]

Finally, it was asked, if there could not be found native South Carolinian Doctors of Divinity, rather than northern Ph.D.s and L.L.D.s to train South Carolina's future leaders, and if not;

> ..then, we had better send our boys to Harvard or Yale, that when they shall become thoroughly versed in Yankee speculations, they may return qualified to train the minds of Carolina youths in Northern Anotions.[14]

The college and the new faculty also had its defenders both in pamphlets [15] and in the press; and five members of the Board of Trustees justified the selection and set forth both the high qualifications and good character of the newly elected faculty. [16] Francis Lieber, in view of the personal attacks leveled at him "felt compelled to write a letter to the Columbia Telescope denying that he was an abolitionist or an atheist."[17] It was in this atmosphere of controversy and factionalism that Francis Lieber assumed the Professorship of History and Political Economy at South Carolina College in 1835.

It was the custom of the time that new faculty present an address to the students and the community at large at the outset of their tenure. In his inaugural address, delivered December 7, 1835 and later published, Lieber clearly outlined his philosophy and beliefs regarding higher education, the role of history and political economy, and the responsibility of a professor:

> Of whatever kind the specific character of an institution for education may be, or in whatever branch a teacher may have to instruct, the great object of education must always

> remain the cultivation of the heart and the head, or, in other words, a moral and intellectual cultivation.[18]

Lieber went on to express his firm belief in fairness and honesty, saying:

> Let us then learn one of the greatest acts of wisdom, to anticipate the judgement of time, and divest ourselves of partial and party views, and assume loftier stations from which we may contemplate our friends as well as our opponents with greater justice.[19]

He stressed that:

> Civil History, the main subject of instruction in history in the college, will necessarily lead to inquiries lead to inquiries into various subjects of politics. It is not only my intention to treat of them while I am proceeding with history, but also to teach them, if time can be found in separate lectures...Political economy...being the science which occupies itself with the material society-with production, exchange and consumption...no one can possibly have thrown a single glance at these subjects and deny that they stand in the most intimate connection with the moral and intellectual interests of a nation.[20]

Despite Lieber's rather sweeping views of the role of history and political economy, and of his own role as a teacher, change was not to come quickly. Immediately following the election of the new faculty, the Board of Trustees passed the following resolution:

> Resolved, that a select Committee be appointed to receive the newly elected Professors, and to indicate to them the course of Instruction each is expected to pursue, and the Text-books from which they will be required to lecture.[21]

At least for the first year of Lieber's tenure, the curriculum appeared firmly set. However, Lieber was not to be easily restrained. In a letter, dated November 24, 1835, to Professor Noll, the Chairman of the Faculty, Lieber outlined his observations, intentions and requirements both as regards to his own discipline and to the College as a whole.[22]

In the letter, sometimes referred to as the Lieber Report, Lieber commented upon the apparent lack of adequate preparation among incoming students, and particularly upon their neglect, or as Lieber termed it "contempt" for geography. He suggested a far deeper probing into the subject of Greek, Latin and Hebrew antiquities, or what the Germans called "archaeology," on the part of all students. As regarded his own discipline Lieber Observed:

> Besides the lectures I shall have to deliver in the branches especially assigned to me, I intend to resume my lecture on the politics of the present time, accompanied by an explanation, historical and philosophical, of all important phenomena of our times, as they successively appear in the periodical press.[23]

On the subject of the periodical press Lieber noted:

> General Hamilton...was kind enough to subscribe, on my suggestion, for an English paper-the Evening Mail...this paper being a weekly compilation of the London Times, without advertising.[24]

He continued by suggesting that the College Library ought to regularly receive such a newspaper. Returning to the subject of geography, he expressed the need for four large maps, of the four portions of the world, for his classroom, and the acquisition of an atlas, with "two or thee copies for the library." There was, in Lieber's view, of course a serious need for books in the library, but agreed to work with the librarian on this topic.
Lieber's request for newspaper subscriptions and maps was submitted to the Board of Trustees. The Board on December 15, 1835, approved the sum of $300.00 for Dr. Lieber's maps[25], however, the $50.00 requested for newspaper subscriptions was tabled.

In December 1835, the Trustees elected Robert Barnwell as President of South Carolina College.[26] Barnwell and Lieber agreed on the College's need to expand its library, and these needs were expressed to the Trustees at their June 21, 1836 meeting. During the December meeting of that year Barnwell asked for $15,000 for the construction of a new library and $5,000.00 for books.[27] During the same session, Lieber again approached the Trustees for the $50.00 for newspaper subscriptions, and more money for the purchase of special books to be awarded to students as "premiums" for academic achievement.[28] With the approval of the $50.00 newspaper subscriptions by the Trustees, Dr. Lieber's "periodical fund" became a matter of special interest and of formal reports at subsequent meetings for some years. Likewise, the library, its building and the purchase of books became an ever more lengthy and detailed topic of consideration by the Trustees. It should be noted that once commented, the Trustees more than adequately supported the growth and funding of the library which grew to very reputable size over the years.

Lieber observed in 1836 that there was a need for a manual or textbook for his courses, and committed himself to writing one, with the utmost seriousness. His Manual of Political Ethics was published in two volumes in 1838 and 1839.[29] Legal and Political Hermeneutics followed in 1839.[30] A third book, On Civil Liberty and Self-Government appeared in 1853.[31]

In Political Ethics, Lieber posited that man has an inalienable moral character, and thus could not by his own consent, or the force of others, become a non-moral being. Lieber applied this principle of ethics to political affairs, and prescribed certain moral laws by which the individual should be governed in political matters. Lieber also explored his concept of the State, a concept clearly different from that expressed earlier by Rousseau:

> The state is aboriginal with man; it is no voluntary association; no continuance of art or invention of suffering; no company of shareholders; no machine; no work of contract by individuals who have lived previously out of it; no necessary evil, no accidental thing: no institution above and separate from society; no instrument for one or a few; no effect of coercion or force of the powerful over the weak; no mystery founded on something beyond comprehension or on a extra-humanbase; the state is a form and faculty of mankind to lead the species toward greater perfection-- it is the glory of man.[32]

Political Ethics treats a variety of subjects, among them, law and administration, government and its powers and abuses, constitutions written and unwritten, crime and punishment, elections and voting, political parties and lastly religion, justice and patriotism, which Lieber called the pillars of society and government. Throughout, there is a pervasive theme, which was to be associated with all of Lieber's writing: "No right without its duties, and no duty without its rights."

Legal and Political Hermeneutics, is a far more philosophical work, and hence, difficult to synthesize. "That branch of science which establishes the principles and rules of interpretation and construction is called Hermeneutics." Lieber explained.[33] Interpretation is the true sense, the actual meaning and intent that the author intended to convey with his words. Construction, on the other had, involves the drawing of inferences and conclusions that lie beyond the actual words. There being no "absolute language" some interpretation and construction will always be necessary. When applying this to the written instruments of government, and to the United States Constitution, Lieber contended that they should be closely construed, because their words had been well weighed and distinctly pronounce powers and authorities granted and prohibited. By present standards, Lieber would be categorized as a "strict constructionist", when it comes to constitutional interpretation.
Civil Liberty is a classic political science textbook. In this work Lieber defines "civil liberty" as being:

> ...that liberty which plainly results from the application of the general idea of freedom to the civil state of man, that is, to his relation as a political being obliged by his nature and destined by his Creator to live in society. It is the result of man's twofold character, as an individual and social being.[34]

He contrasts the Anglican (English) and Gallic an (French) liberty (as seen in the light of the 1848 revolution in France), as defused power on the one hand with checks and balances, and centralized authority on the other. It is indeed a treatise on self-government, seeing such representative government as the greatest safeguard against absolutism of the executive on the one hand, and of the masses on the other.

> The noblest human work, nobler even than literature and science, is broad civil liberty, well secured and wisely handled. The highest ethical and social production of which man, with his inseparable moral, jural, aethietic and religious attributes, is capable, is the comprehensive and minutely organic self-government of a free people; and a people truly free at home and dealing in fairness and justice with other nations, is the greatest and unfortunately also the rarest, subject offered in all the breadth and length of history.[35]

Considering these three major works, in the spirit of their time, Dr. Lieber could be categorized as a liberal, an nationalist and a constitutionalist.

Lieber's trilogy earned him international recognition, and while Lieber himself refers to using Political Ethics in his classes, there can be little doubt that the ideas and philosophies contained in the other volumes were expounded by the author during numerous lectures. From the journal of Giles J. Patterson and the reminiscences of James F. Caldwell[37]one can piece together at least the essence of Lieber's teaching content.
Patterson recalls:

> I am now laboring under the excitement of a long examination by Dr. Lieber. He had me up for three quarters of an hour upon the divine rights of kings and the divine rights of the majority. His first question was "What did Mr. Calhoun mean by the Divine rights of the majority?"[38]

This line of questioning could indicate that Lieber stressed the study of various different political philosophies. Although John C. Calhoun's A Disquisition on Government and A Discourse on the Constitution and Government of the United States were not published until after Calhoun's death in 1850, his political philosophy and writings were known to scholars such as Lieber, and taught by him despite their differences with Lieber's own.
The changes and reforms which Lieber had encouraged and supported were not limited to his own discipline. His early encouraged and support of the library, a project actively pursued by President Barnwell and others, resulted

in the expansion of the library to 19,000 volumes by 1850, which, according to Freidel, equaled the holdings of the University of Virginia, exceeded those of Columbia and Princeton, and was surpassed only by Harvard University.[39] Lieber maintained a voluminous correspondence around the world with scholars, writers and friends, among them Alexis De Tocqueville, Alexander Von Humboldt, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow and J.C. Bluntschli.[40] Much of this correspondence related to the exchange of ideas and the transmission of books and manuscripts.

In one area, however, Lieber was to meet with little success. At the May 1840 meeting of the Trustees, Lieber recommended that the study of French be added to the curriculum, basing his recommendation on the fact that an ever increasing body of literature was now being produced in the vernacular[41] As Lieber saw it, the contemporary academic emphasis on the study of classical Greek and Latin was beginning to decrease in importance, and the need for modern language training was on the rise. The question of French language instruction was tabled in 1840. In 1842, the question arose again and was then vetoed by the Trustees.[42] It was to be many years after Dr. Lieber's departure from South Carolina College before modern languages would appear as a part of the curriculum.

While Lieber was never really happy in what he called his "exile" in South Carolina, and constantly sought a professorship in the North:

> ...the Ivy League's loss was South Carolina College's gain, and the "golden age" of the institution can in large measure be called the age of Francis Lieber... When on occasion James Gordon Bennett's New York Herald, or the Boston and Washington papers mentioned South Carolina College, it was Francis Lieber they spoke of, not Thornwell or the other professors. More than a great scholar, he was also a great teacher, and his national reputation and the loyalty and support of the alumni he had taught made him in 1855, the leading candidate for the presidency (of the college)[43]

Yet, there was a certain in irony about Lieber's stay in South Carolina, as J. Marion Sims pointed out:

> The figure of our first academic political philosopher appears oddly out of place in the midst of the South Carolina politicians, yet fate sent the studious German in the thick of the Fire Eaters, to cogitate a philosophy of freedom in the land of slavery, and to justify the spirit of nationalism amongst advocates of particularism.[44]

As noted in the introductory paragraphs, Dr. Lieber's arrival at South Carolina College was shrouded in opposition and controversy, much of it stemming from the internal political and religious factionalism of the state. In a letter dated October 27, 1835, Bishop John (England) of Charleston wrote to Lieber as follows:

> I have been a silent, but by no means an unattentive or uninterested observer of the contest that has been waged regarding the college. I am quite gratified at the reception of your friends and at the complexion of your associates-and if I could presume to convey one word of advice it would be this. Keep free of political & religious parties, preserve discipline and order in the establishment-turn the abilities you have to account for your students. Answer no attacks made upon you & you must succeed.[45]

It is hard to say whether Lieber, the historian and philosopher, reflected upon the Cooper era or was impressed by Bishop John's advice. Whatever the cause, Lieber meticulously avoided involvement in state politics, at least until 1851. This is not to say that he did not participate in governmental matters, but rather that he bent his

energies toward social rather than political causes. In cooperation with Dorothea Dix he unsuccessfully proposed prison reform,[46] and was also active in school reform, particularly for orphans, based upon his earlier work in Philadelphia and with Girard College.[47]

Lieber's self-imposed political neutrality contributed to stilling the general controversy surrounding South Carolina College, but did not preclude some from persistently remaining hostile to his tenure at the institution. Among those who never "forgave" or forgot Francis Lieber was a powerful trustee, Judge John Belton O'Neall. In December 1842, Judge O'Neall introduced a motion to abolish the chair of History and Political Economy at the College, however, the committee to which this resolution was referred, rejected it.[48] Again in 1845, O'Neall attempted to abolish Lieber's chair, but the Trustees defeated the motion by a vote of twenty-three.[49] Thus, a shadow of opposition continued to persist throughout Lieber's tenure, and it was to surface in full force in 1855.

In 1851, Lieber made his lone, and perhaps fateful, venture into politics. On the occasion of the 4th of July, a mass meeting of pro-Union men was held in Greenville, and Lieber prepared and address entitled "On Secession." It was, all in all, a rather "mild" address, stating in part:

> There are those who pretend to make light of the Union; there are those who willfully shut their eyes to the many positive blessings she has bestowed upon us, and who seem to forget that the good which the Union with her Supreme Court, or any other vast and lasting institution, bestows upon men, consists as much in preventing evils as in showering benefits into our laps...There are those who speak of the remedy of secession-a remedy-an amputation would be remedy, indeed, to cure a troublesome corn, or as cutting one's throat would remedy a migraine... What is secession? Is it revolution, or is it a lawful remedy to which a state is permitted to resort in the right of its own sovereignty?[50]

Lieber concluded:

> I will only add that I, for one, dare not do anything toward the disruption of the Union...In my position as a servant of the state, in a public institution of education, I have imposed upon myself the duty of using my influence with the young neither one way nor the other in this discussion. I have scrupulously and conscientiously adhered to it in all my teaching and intercourse. But I am a man and a citizen, and as such I have the right, or the duty, as the case may be, to speak my mind and my inmost convictions on solemn occasions before my fellow-citizens, and I have thus not hesitated to put down these remarks... God save the common wealth! God save the common bond![51]

This address, later to become known as the "Union Address," re-kindled the smoldering embers of the opposition, and left little doubt in their minds as to Lieber's personal convictions regarding the Union and secession. The fires of secession were already smoldering in South Carolina in 1851, and Lieber had done little to cool the ardor. His expression of his own beliefs, regardless how mild had made Lieber some powerful enemies.

On November 29, 1854, President Thornwell resigned, but was asked to stay on until 1855.[52] Lieber now the senior professor at South Carolina College, sincerely desired and worked hard to attain the presidency. However, the opposition once again joined forces and on December 4, 1855, C.T. McKay was elected president by eighteen to Lieber's nine.[53] Lieber resigned, and his resignation was accepted November 26, 1856.[54] Chroniclers of the period and the College generally agree that even if he had been elected, Lieber would not have survived long as president of South Carolina, since the political climate of the state was rapidly shifting toward secession and war.

Francis Lieber left South Carolina and took up a professorship at Columbia University. His writings took on a strident pro-union, anti-slavery tone, and the republican Lieber soon became an ardent Republican. In 1863, Lieber wrote "Instructions for the Government of Armies of the United States in the Field" (General Order No. 100), a work which professor Bluntschli, the first president of the Institute for International Law acclaimed as follows:

> The Instructions for the Government of Armies of the United States in the Field were drawn up by Lieber at the insistence of President Lincoln, and formed the first codification of International Articles of War (Kriegvoelkerrecht). This was a deed of great moment in the history of international law and civilization.[55]

During the war, Lieber wrote on guerrilla warfare and on the treatment of prisoners of war.[56] However, after his departure from South Carolina, Lieber never produced another epic volume on political philosophy.

An ironic, but not rare, sidebar to Lieber's life came as the nation divided and went to war in 1861. His sons Hamilton and Norman joined the union Army, while his son Oscar joined Wade Hampton's Legion of the Confederacy. Hamilton was wounded, and lost an arm at the Battle of Fort Donelson. Oscar was killed near Williamsburg during the siege of Richmond.[57]

Francis Lieber was a "universal" man in the best traditions of the nineteenth Century. Soldier, scholar, encyclopedist, teacher, philosopher and nationalist he wrote on a variety of topics including history, political theory, ethics, international law, prison reform, education reform and military regulation. Throughout his teaching career, Francis Lieber stressed the need to be aware of the events of the time, no matter how remote, and to study the implications of these events on the future of our own society. He warned his students:

> Our age has added new and startling commentaries to many subjects discussed in the Political Ethics and things there spoken of as probably past all recurrence have since burst upon an amazed world. We would never have supposed that socialism and despotism, the fatal negations of freedom, could have been boldly proclaimed in this century as the defense and refuge of humanity...A large part of Europe is in a state of violence, either convulsive action or enforced repose, and one of the greatest nations has apparently once more sought refuge in the reminiscences of the noblest time of Rome... In such times it behooves us to keep a steady eye on all the sighs of the times. Let us be attentive; let us understand. Goth says truly that we must learn to read occasionally between the lines of books in order to understand them. It is a remark which applies with still greater force to the pages of history and those that record the changes of our own days.[58]

This maxim stressed by Lieber one hundred and fifty years ago, remains as pertinent today as it was in Lieber's time.

Francis Lieber, throughout his tenure at South Carolina College, stressed the moral and intellectual responsibility incumbent on a teacher to develop his students' ability to analyze and reason, and to arrive at conclusions rationally. He shunned the idea of partisanship and partiality, and freely exposed his students to a wide variety of ideas including some which he himself did not endorse. In doing so he clashed with powerful elements in the community who believed that the primary task of the College was the teaching of "proper" ideas, and the support of the status quo. As an outsider, worse yet a

foreigner, in a parochial society, his very presence on the faculty was viewed with suspicion and distrust from he outset. As his reputation grew and his efforts to introduce new thoughts and ideas expanded, his efforts met with increasing efforts to curb his activities, and ultimately to make his position untenable. The subject of the debate has changed, but efforts, by some elements of the society to control and use institutions of higher learning for their own purposes or as a part of a larger agenda continues. In a period of ever increasing emphasis on accountability, it may do well to ask; "accountable to whom, for what and based on what criteria?"

ENDTNOTES

[1]Daniel Walker Hollis, University of South Carolina. Vol. 1 South Carolina College. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1951). p. 48.

[2]Ibid., pp. 31-2.

[3]Ibid., pp.97-118.

[4]Trustee Minutes of South Carolina College, November 27, 1833.

[5]Edwin L. Green, A History of the University of South Carolina. (Columbia: The State Company, 1916), p. 437.

[6]Trustee Minutes, November 26, 1834.

[7]Ibid., December 5, 1834.

[8]Ibid., December 9, 1834.

[9]Ibid., November 12 and 17, 1834.

[10]Ibid., June 4, 1835.

[11]The Spy in Columbia. The Mysteries of government or Favoritism Unveiled: A New Year's Present to the People of South Carolina. (Printed Somewhere and Published Everywhere (sic.), 1835).

[12]Civis. "The South Carolina College." Camden Journal and Southern Whig. Vol. X, No. 33, August 22, 1835, p. 3

[13]Ibid., No. 34, August 29, 1835, pp. 2-3

[14]Ibid., No. 35, September 12, 1835, p. 2.

[15]John G. Brown, H. Hebermont, Albert Moore Smith, James H. Taylor and Theodore Stark. The True Motives Exposed for the Attacks Upon South Carolina College. (Charleston: 1835).

[16]Robert Y. Nayne, Henry W. DeSaussure, David Johnson, William Harper and Patrick Noble. Appeal in Behalf of the South Carolina College. (Charleston: A. E. Miller, 1835).

[17]Hollis, op. Cit., p. 123

[18]Francis Lieber. On History and Political Economy as Necessary Branches of Superior Education in Free States. (Columbia: A.S. Johnson, 1836). Also found in Lieber, The Miscellaneous Writings of Francis Lieber. Vol. 1 (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1880) p. 181.

[19]Ibid., p. 188

[20]Ibid., pp. 200-201.

[21]Trustee Minutes, June 5, 1835.

[22]Letter from Francis Lieber to Professor Noll, dated November 24, 1835. Lieber Papers, Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina.

[23]Ibid.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Trustee Minutes, December 15, 1835.

[26]Trustee Minutes, December 3 and 15, 1835.

[27]Ibid., December 8, 1836.

[28]Ibid., December 2 and 19, 1836.

[29]Francis Lieber . Manual of Political Ethics Designed Chiefly for the Use of Colleges and students at Law. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1890). Originally published in Boston: Charles Little and James Brown, 1838-1839.

[30]Francis Lieber. Legal and Political Hermeneutics. (Boston: Charles Little and James Brown, 1839).

[31]Francis Lieber. On Civil Liberty and Self-Government. (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott and Co., 1859). Originally published in two volumes in 1853

[32]Lieber, Political Ethics, op. Cit., p. 183.

[33]Lieber. Hermeneutics, op. cit. P. 52.

[34]Lieber. Civil Liberty, op. Cit., p. 25.

[35]Ibid., p.26.

[36]Giles J. Patterson. Journal of a Southern Student: 1846-1848. Richmond Groom Beatty, Editor. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1944).

[37]James F. J. Caldwell. "Looking Back," The Carolinian. November 1914, pp. 94-96.

[38]Patterson, op. Cit.

[39]Frank Freidel. Francis Lieber: Nineteenth Century Liberal. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1947), p. 147.

[40]Letters contained in the Lieber Collection.

[41]Trustee Minutes, May 6, 1840.

[42]Trustee Minutes, December 2 and 3, 1845.

[43]Hollis, op. Cit.

[44]Ibid., p. 179. Quoted from J. Marion Sims. The Story of My Life. (New York: D. Appleton And Col., 1884).

[45]Lieber Papers.

[46]Francis Lieber. A popular Essay on the Subject of Penal Law and on Uninterrupted Solitary Confinement at Labor as Contradicted to Solitary Confinement at Night and Doing Labor by Day. (Philadelphia: The Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prison, 1838).

[47]Francis Lieber. A Report on an Organization Proposed for Girard College for Orphans. (Philadelphia: Carey, Lea & Blanchard, 1834).

[48]Trustee Minutes, December 2 and 7, 1842.

[49]Ibid., December 2, 1845.

[50]Francis Lieber. An Address on Secession: Delivered in South Carolina in 1851. (New York: Loyal Publishing Society, 1855), pp. 4-5.

[51]Ibid., p.12.

[52]Trustee Minutes, November 29, 1854.

[53]Trustee Minutes, December 4, 1855.

[54]Trustee Minutes, December 5, 1855 and November 26, 1856.

[55]Dr. J. C. Bluntschli, "Lieber's Service to Political Science and International Law" in Lieber, Miscellaneous Writings, op. Cit., pp. 7-14, p. 12.

[56]Francis Lieber. Guerrilla Parties Considered with Reference to the Law and Usages of War (1862) and The Status of Rebel prisoners of War. (The Independent, New York, May 10, 1855). Both included in Lieber, Miscellaneous Writings, op. Cit., Vol. 2, pp. 275-292 and 293-297.

[57]Freidel, op. Cit., pp. 325-326.

[58]Lieber, On Civil Liberty. Op. Cit., pp. VI and VII

The History of The Film Industry in South Carolina: The Early Years:
1902-1926

In examining the events of almost an entire century of South Carolina's film history, it is clear that the business, social, and artistic patterns that have evolved are directly connected to the type and amount of interaction between South Carolinians and the out-of-state parties. In short, the more that in-state businesses and governments rallied, supported, and promoted the film industry, the more successful their coalition became. There are four distinct periods of development of the industry in this century: the initial development period (1902- 1920s), the waning years (1930-1960s), the rebirth (1970-mid 1980s), and the modern period.

This presentation will discuss the first period of commercial filmmaking in South Carolina. Unknown by many, South Carolina has been part of the film industry since 1902. Although most people associate the American motion picture industry with Hollywood, it first developed in New York and New Jersey, only later moving Westward after a brief stop-over in the Southeastern United States. The first documented, filmed images of South Carolina were newsreels . The Edison Manufacturing Company visited South Carolina to record scenes of the 1902 Charleston Exposition. There are four different films of the Exposition. The first, Midway of Charleston Exposition, shows people enjoying the amusement section. It is noted in the American Film Institute Catalog that according to Edison, this footage is perfectly photographed and that it shows "one of the greatest crowds of people ever seen in a motion picture."[1] The second, Panoramic View of Charleston Exposition, shows the grounds including the South Carolina Building, the Cotton Palace, the Palace of Commerce, the great Auditorium, the grounds and landscape. The third, Loading a Vessel at Charleston, S.C. shows pine lumber from Charleston's Anderson Lumber Company being loaded on to a steamship. It is unclear if this activity was directly related to the Exposition, but it was photographed at the same time. The final film, President Roosevelt Reviewing the Troops at Charleston Exposition, shows Theodore Roosevelt reviewing troops in front of the great Auditorium. Standing with him are Mrs. Roosevelt, Captain F.W. Wagener, Mayor Smith of Charleston, Governor M. McSweeney of South Carolina and Governor Avcock.[2] Each of these newsreel films were just a few minutes in length, with the longest one (Panoramic View) being 185 feet. American Film Institute references indicate that this film is still in existence at the Library of Congress, however this could not be verified.

Although this footage was taken to document a special event and was not part of a fictional creation, the fact that the Edison Company, and probably Edison himself, had some knowledge of, and an early experience with, South Carolina played a deciding factor in the company's later return.

Moving pictures were initially developed in 1878 as a tool for the scientific community to record and slow down action that occurred too fast for the human eye to see. It took another quarter century for the concept and technology of moving pictures to advance and be recognized as a method of entertainment. Various small entrepreneurs, mostly in the New York City area, dabbled in making short films that were shown in the penny arcades and nickelodeons. As the production industry grew, there was a tremendous struggle for a market share among these various producers. In 1908, Thomas Edison formed a collective of the top nine filmmakers called the Motion Picture Patents Company (MPPC) or more commonly, "The Trust". The formation and history of the MPPC is a turbulent story which I will not include here. Suffice it to say that the creation of the Trust was an effort by Edison to exert complete control over the burgeoning film industry.

Edison and the other Trust members had centered their primary production facilities in the New York/New Jersey area, however a combination of factors prompted Edison to experiment with filmmaking in the American South and West. The weather conditions of New York had always curtailed winter production. In these early years, there were no artificial lighting systems and snow often impeded production. As early as 1897 Edison had encouraged a small support industry in California, filming there when special scenes were needed or when Northern winters became too bad. The unusually harsh winter in 1908 prompted Edison to move to a more amenable climate, however, in that year he decided to send the Kalem Company to commence production in Florida instead of California. Before the decline of the Trust's power and before either of the West or East Coast support industries fully developed, producers felt that being closer to New York was an important advantage.

Although Southern production was centered in Florida, filmmakers reveled in their new environment and scouted the whole South for new and exciting places to film.[3] The Edison Company searched throughout the winter of 1913-14 for idyllic shooting locations and in March, 1914 moved a production crew to Charleston, South Carolina. The story of commercial moviemaking in South Carolina begins with the production of The Southerners."[4] This three-reel film,[5] adapted from the novel of the same name written by Cyrus Townsend Brady, was produced by the Edison Company and was copyrighted May 2, 1914.[6] While it is not documented why the production company specifically chose Charleston to film its story, it is accurate to say that Charleston offered all the physical locations needed for the settings, and had a core of ready-made actors available - the cadets of the Citadel. Sadly, no known copies of this film still exist.

The tale of "The Southerners" is set in Mobile, Alabama in 1861. A young United States naval officer takes a leave of duty to visit his Southern home and his lady love, only to be faced with the decision of adhering to his oath to the U.S. Navy or deserting to join his friends and family in support of the Confederate cause.[7] This film, though not quite an epic, was classified as a special presentation. It was of medium length for the time, approximately 40 minutes, and filmed "on-location" with realistic settings and battle re-creations. Although Mobile was the proper setting for the story, Charleston offered several cinemagraphic similarities which corresponded to what the script required, including an actual navy yard, the soldiers (or cadets), battlegrounds, and romantic Southern plantations.

The March 19, 1914 edition of the Charleston Evening Post noted that the cadets, clad in Confederate gray, had been all around the city to film scenes. A later article noted that these filming locations included The Oaks at Otranto (now a famous country club near Goose Creek, S.C.), the Battery, the Boulevard, the Yacht Club, the Citadel campus, Colonial Lake, Ashley Hall gardens, Lawton's Farm, and the Isle of Palms.[8] The original production schedule for The Southerners called for the entire film to be shot in Charleston, including the re-creation of the battle scenes between Farragut's fleet in Mobile Bay and the shore batteries. The plan was to use Farragut's real flagship, the *Hartford*, which had been decommissioned to the Charleston Naval Yard. However, upon further examination, the ship was found to be in a poor and unusable condition, forcing the Edison Company to use one of their largest New York area studios to re-create the scene.

The filming episode in Charleston was more significant than a typical on location shoot. The Edison Company producers chose to visit Charleston not just to aesthetically satisfy the look of their film by using an authentic visual setting, but also because they were searching for the ideal Southern city to establish a studio. According to press releases from the Edison Company, they had been visiting and investigating Southern cities throughout the 1913-1914 winter season to find the right location to build a new studio.[9] The Edison Company offered further evidence that it was considering Charleston for their new studio when they instituted a "trial run" by constructing a studio in the rear of the Princess Theater in downtown Charleston at 304 King Street.[10] The usual practice at this time was to travel to a special

location that had unique scenery, film the exterior shots needed, and move back to New York in the spring to film the interior shots in the already established studio buildings. The construction of an on-site studio for the interior shots was highly unusual. This temporary Edison Studio, in the back of the Charleston's Princess Theater, was the first commercial film studio built in South Carolina.

The Southerners opened nationally on May 22, 1914. It was shown in Charleston on June 8 and 9, 1914 at the Princess Theater. The Edison Company never did establish a permanent studio in Charleston, nor did it ever make another film there, however, Charleston's first film experience was very favorable. The Edison Company contributed several hundred dollars to the Citadel's Athletic Association[11], used several residents as extras, and used a wide variety of Charleston locales. It was important that producers experienced success outside of their traditional filming locations, but what would prove to be more important was that the citizens of Charleston had learned that film production could be a beneficial and profitable business to draw into the region.

After the profitable and enticing experience with the Edison Company, Charleston quietly made plans to continue bringing filmmakers to the town. The records of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce from 1916 to 1920 indicate that its members undertook considerable activity to recruit film production in South Carolina. An internal letter dated September 27, 1917 written by C.M. Benedict, the director of the Chamber's Tourists and Conventions Department, indicates that negotiations had been underway with its Department of Publicity to fund and jointly supervise an office that would "work in the interest of having moving picture companies come to Charleston to make pictures."[12] Benedict hired E. Joyce Milberry initially for two months, and provided him with a $250.00 salary and expense account. The 1917 annual report, prepared shortly thereafter, notes that within Milberry's initial two months he was able to prepare statistical material about and for the motion picture industry, to contribute to the Chamber of Commerce's column in the Charleston Evening Post by reporting his activities, and to begin his campaign to interest producers in making pictures in Charleston. He brought in two companies to investigate conditions, responded to a large number of companies which were considering Charleston's advantages, and sent comprehensive picture albums of Charleston's views to producers.[13] The annual report also notes that the Chamber's structure had changed to place the office under the full authority of the Tourists and Conventions Department.

The 1918 Annual Report illustrates that not only were the first two months of Milberry's work fruitful, it was so successful that in 1918 a sub-committee consisting of fourteen members was formed in the Tourists and Conventions Department called the Motion Picture Development Committee. After reviewing the work done since September, 1917 in a substantially detailed section, the report notes that hundreds of locations and unusual "properties" were investigated and listed by the Motion Picture Development Committee and a large number of local people registered to be used as extras for filming.

The 1918 Annual Report supplies the most significant evidence about Charleston's motion picture activity during this period. Four large companies (names not given) came to the city to work in the early winter of 1917 and about an equal number came in the late winter and spring of 1918. The Chamber of Commerce calculated that these companies brought a minimum of $150,000 to Charleston's economy. The possibility of building a studio in town was seriously considered but reluctantly dismissed as an unwise action to undertake during the First World War.[14] The production of motion pictures slowed at the end of 1918 which was attributed to an unusually mild winter in the North, and an epidemic of influenza which curtailed the demand for new films.[15]

The records reflecting activity for 1919 are very brief, saying only that motion pictures companies had come to Charleston and that the city had co-operated with them. The lack of detail in the report could stem from the organizational change within the Chamber of Commerce that year. The promotion of motion picture activity now fell under the auspices of its newly formed Department of Publicity and

Conventions which, if did not slow such promotional activity, certainly did not report it with the zeal of its predecessor committee in the previous year.[16]

The 1920 Annual Report made the same general statement about bringing moving picture companies to Charleston, however, in addition, it listed several companies and stars that came to town. These included: Famous Players-Lasky Corp., Goldwyn, the David Wark Griffith party, Vitagraph Co., Dorothy Gish, George Fawcett, Charles Lane, Corinne Griffith, and Dorothy Dalton.[17] Unfortunately, succeeding Chamber of Commerce reports are not available.

Although these annual reports are informative, they lack certain details. Identifying missing data about the films involves a methodology of cross-referencing information with copyright entries and various indexes from the American Film Institute, the Hollywood Film Archive, and the Library of Congress to discover the missing dates, studios, stars or storylines. Such reconstructed information can then be expanded by locating movie reviews in trade magazines and the local newspapers. The Charleston paper usually mentioned if the film had been made in town.

The Charleston News and Courier for Sunday November 25, 1917 noted on page 12 that the first success of the Chamber's recruitment was Wanted, A Mother, filmed by Brady Pictures, a World Film Corporation company. The party consisted of eleven members including Harry [Harley] Knowles who was the director and Madge Evans, the film's star. The story is of a grief-stricken widower and his relationship with his daughter. Indications are that the film company was in town only for a short time to film a scene in Magnolia Gardens. Both the director and the company officials were impressed with the town and were quoted as saying that they would consider returning, especially because of the convenience that Charleston was twelve hours closer to New York than Jacksonville.

Shortly thereafter, the December 3, 1917 edition of the Charleston Evening Post revealed that another film entitled The Rise and Fall of the [Southern] Confederacy was to be made in Charleston by the American Feature Film Corporation. This was the first local production to make an extended stay in the city, and it was later reported that its production time exceeded three months .[18] It is unclear whether this film was ever completed and released. Four months was an unusually long production time for pictures of this era. The length could be attributed to the immensity of the project, which was to produce a seven-reel film, or it could be indicative of production problems. There is no record that this film was copyrighted or released under its original title. Production continued in 1918 with a return visit of the Brady Company to film The Eyes of Rau. As with The Rise and Fall of the [Southern] Confederacy, there is no record of this film being copyrighted and released.

Unlike its two predecessors, the next film produced that month was a huge financial success. One of the leaders in film production, the Fox Film Corporation, came to Charleston in March 1918 to film Peg of the Pirates. Their visit lasted four weeks, during which time the company spent approximately $30,000. The picture had a forty-member crew and was directed by O.A.C. Lund. The majority of the film was made in the city, on the harbor, or on the local islands. The film starred Peggy Hyland and Sidney Mason and was a story of high adventure set in South Carolina at the time of Captain Kidd. Peg of the Pirates was exhibited in Charleston at the Garden Theater Monday and Tuesday, May 13-14, 1918.[19] Although, the film was released with much fanfare, promoted heavily in trade magazines and newspapers as a special feature, and was popular with the audiences, the critical reviews were not favorable.[20]

Three simultaneous productions in one location is highly unusual for one town, even today, and is an indication of the importance of Charleston as a motion picture production center during this period. In fact, during the 1918 filming season there was almost continuous production. The next film, made in April, 1918, and produced by the Pathe Exchange [Company] was entitled How Could You, Caroline?, a dramatic comedy about the misadventures of Caroline Rogers (played by Bessie Love) and her search for marriage. This film opened at Charleston's Garden Theater on June 3, 1918.[21]

Identifying films made in Charleston through the 1920s, when newspaper accounts declined and Chamber of Commerce reports lacked detail, is a difficult task primarily because the records of production, and indeed most of the films themselves, have disappeared. The aforementioned indices, which do contain a good amount of information, are we still lack the rich detail gained from viewing these films directly. Unfortunately, most of the early films have disappeared via deterioration and lack of preservation initiatives. Nevertheless, I have identified several more films which were made in South Carolina during the latter part of this early period.

The first film of the 1920s was Vitagraph's Bab's Candidate, a political comedy, copyrighted in 1920. The story was based on a short story in the December, 1919 issue of Harper's Monthly Magazine called "Gumshoes 4-B." It is noted that several scenes were shot in Charleston and Savannah; however the "Southern connection" to the story is not clear.

Two other films made in this decade were remakes of earlier films. Neither of the originals had the South Carolina plot connection that was added to the remakes. The Valley of Hate was a five-reel film made in 1924, and was based on an earlier two-reel version made in 1915. The story is of a South Carolina man who inherits property in a remote valley. While visiting the valley he falls in love and must fight to win the lady's hand. The film was long for its time (sixty-five minutes) and though the story and acting were considered trite, its cinematography was heralded.[22] The Auction Block, the next film documented, was copyrighted in February, 1926 by Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Pictures, and was a remake of the 1917 Goldwyn film of the same name. The story is a comedic drama about New York life. The 1926 version gave one of the main characters a Southern heritage, hailing from Palmdale, South Carolina, in contrast to the New York lifestyle.

Charleston actively campaigned for film companies to come to town and did much to accommodate them when they did. However, Charleston was not the only South Carolina town to host a film crew. Pied Piper Malone, produced by Adolf Zukor and the Famous Players-Lasky Corporation, was a sea-faring adventure set in New England. The director, Alfred Green, originally wanted to film the story in the Northeast, but winter weather proved problematic. His solution, in the fall of 1923, was to locate a substitute which he found in the town of Georgetown, South Carolina.[23] The first film ever shot in Georgetown began production on Wednesday, November 7; filming was finished three weeks later.[24] The locations used in the film included numerous shots of the town's waterfront and North Island. Many local businesses and landmarks were used in the film including the Revolutionary War home of General Lafayette, Prince and Front Streets, the homes of the Kaminski and Schenck families, the town clock, and the courthouse.[25] The director had planned to relocate to Charleston to find and film some large boats, but the local B.A. Munnerlyn Company provided access to the Baltimore and Carolina steamer, as well as a privately owned schooner, averting the need for a relocation.[26] The citizens of Georgetown warmly welcomed the film project and took part in the excitement generated from it. Numerous residents, including many local children, competed for the honor of appearing in the film; and the Georgetown Chamber of Commerce hosted a party for the cast and crew. After production finished, the crew returned the hospitality by presenting a benefit performance for the Health Fund of the Civic League, raising $700.[27] In total, "it was estimated that between ten and fifteen thousand dollars of good, hard cash was put into circulation" in Georgetown as a result of the visit.[28]

Producers of motion pictures came to South Carolina for a variety of reasons during the early twentieth century. South Carolina was twelve hours closer to New York than Florida and the state offered a variety of appealing locales and resources which lent themselves well to film production. These two factors, combined with the fact that Charleston had engaged in an aggressive campaign for production business, created an atmosphere that enticed producers to visit repeatedly. The revenues created, not only by the funds the production companies spent, but also by the tourism dollars generated from the visual publicity

of South Carolina on film, encouraged local businesses and governments to continue their efforts. South Carolina had created a new, highly successful industry for itself. However, in the mid-1920s that new industry began to flounder. The power of the major studios and the creation of "Hollywood" virtually destroyed the fledgling South Carolina industry. The moviemakers began to use, almost exclusively, studios and backlots for their productions, and, despite the fact that South Carolina was experiencing a cultural renaissance in the '20s and '30s with authors like Dubose Heyward, Julia Peterkin, and Josephine Pinckney, the new Hollywood chose to rely on repetitive and formula stories. The citizens of South Carolina soon came to embrace the attitude that if Hollywood did want them, they did not want Hollywood, and so it stood for the next forty years.

The industry's initial experiment with South Carolina illustrated from the beginning that the businesses and governments of South Carolina became active partners with the film industry. The joint participation between the community leaders and the filmmakers in 1914 established a foundation for the industry's growth and success, but when that cooperation slowly eroded, local film production virtually disappeared. A few films were made in South Carolina in the next four decades, for a variety of special reasons, but the industry did not enjoy success again until 1970, when the state government began to recognize the potential for economic and cultural development. The active partnership was revived, and although it is continually evolving, it illustrates one of South Carolina's most successful coalitions between business and government.

ENDNOTES

[1] Elias Sauada, American Film Institute Catalog of Motion Pictures in the Unites States, Film Beginnings, 1893-1910: A Work in Progress (Scarecrow Press, Inc: Metuchen, N.J., 1995), 672.

[2] Ibid. p. 612, 791, 858.

[3] The establishment of the industry in Jacksonville, Florida is well documented in Richard Alan Nelson's, Florida and the American Motion Picture Industry 1989-1980 (New York: Garland Publishing, 1983).

[4] "Citadel Cadets Playing at War," Charleston Evening Post, 19 March 1914, 8.

[5] One reel of film played for 10 to 13 minutes in this early period.

[6] Catalog of Copyright Entries, Cumulative Series: Motion Pictures, 1912-1939 (Washington D.C.: Library of Congress - Copyright Office, 1951), 800.

[7] Review of The Southerners, in Moving Picture World 20 no. 7 (May 16, 1914): 1006.

[8] Review of The Southerners in the Charleston Evening Post, June 6, 1914, 10.

[9] Nelson, Florida and the American Motion Picture Industry, 518.

[10] Review of The Southerners in the Charleston Evening Post, June 6, 1914, 10.

[11] "Citadel Cadets Playing at War," Charleston Evening Post, 19 March, 1914, 8 and Review of "The Southerners" in the Charleston Evening Post, June 6, 1914, 10.

[12] C.M. Benedict-Director, Tourists and Conventions Department to E.B. Walker-Acting Secretary of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, September 27, 1917, Charleston Historical Society, Accession Number 34-381b, Minutes of Meetings of Committees, 1916-1918, Charleston, S.C.

[13] Charleston Chamber of Commerce Annual Report, 1917. Charleston Historical Society, Accession Number 34-b, Folder 381, Charleston, S.C.

[14] It is not clear from the report whether the Chamber of Commerce was considered having an out-of-state filmmaker construct a studio in Charleston or if the City itself was to undertake the project.

[15] Charleston Chamber of Commerce Annual Report, 1918. Charleston Historical Society, Accession Number 34-381b, Folder 381, Charleston, S.C.

[16] Charleston Chamber of Commerce Annual Report, 1919. Charleston Historical Society, Accession Number 34-381b, Folder 381, Charleston, S.C.

[17] Charleston Chamber of Commerce Annual Report, 1920. Charleston Historical Society, Accession Number 34-381b, Folder 381, Charleston, S.C.

[18] The Charleston Evening Post, 16 November 1918, 10.

[19] "Peggy Hyland is Garden Headliner," Charleston Evening Post, 13 May 1918, 6.

[20] "May 31, 1918 - Peg of the Pirates," Variety Film Reviews, 1907-1920 (New York: Garland Publishing, 1983).

[21] Charleston Evening Post, 3 June 1918, 8.

[22] "July 9, 1924 - The Valley of Hate," Variety Film Reviews, 1921-1925, (New York: Garland Publishing, 1983).

[23] Frank Thompson, Lost Films- Important Movies That Disappeared (New York: Citadel Press Books, 1996), 119.

[24] Georgetown Times, 9 November 1923, 1.

[25] Marybelle Howe, "No Name, No Blame" (personal reminiscence, 1977) Filming in South Carolina Collection, Caroliniana Library, Columbia, University of South Carolina; Kenneth Munden, ed., American Film Institute Catalog of Feature Films 1921-1939 (R.R. Bowker Comp., New York, 1971), 603.

[26] Thompson, Lost Films, 120-121.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Georgetown Times, 30 November 1923, 1.

"GONE OUT SOUTH": A Nineteenth-Century Social and Economic Interchange
Between the Citizens of Maine and South Carolina Port Towns

During the nineteenth century several communities at both extremities of a north-south lumber trade route established social and economic ties. Citizens engaged in various aspects of maritime trade in the busy Penobscot Bay ports of Searsport, Bucksport, Belfast, and Stockton Springs became intricately connected to citizens living in the Lowcountry ports of Little River, Georgetown, and Bucksville on the lower Waccamaw River.

Because traveling inland was difficult and hazardous over poor roads, the inhabitants of Atlantic coastal towns were often more familiar with distant ports than with their own backcountry areas. During the era of the sailing ship, farmers had little opportunity to travel, therefore their contact with outsiders was limited. It was the seafarers and those engaged in maritime commerce that were in touch with the peoples of the world, thus giving the port city an aura of worldly sophistication. When one visits the sleepy coastal villages of downeast Maine, bustling with tourists in the summer months, it is difficult to imagine that their nineteenth century citizens traveled more frequently to exotic ports than to neighboring inland towns. Not only did their town shipyards build the schooners, clippers, and downeasters which returned with a variety of exotic goods, but they also trained their young men to become a large portion of the world's seafaring population.[1]

Likewise, the port towns of the South Carolina Lowcountry, perceived by outsiders to be sleepy, static communities, were once centers of vitality, culture and sophistication. An Horry correspondent for The Marion (SC) Star, calling himself "Waccamaw," wrote of Little River Village, South Carolina in 1868: "Prominent among the characteristics of the Little River people is their energy and hospitality, two traits ever found among those who have commercial intercourse with other parts of the world."[2] After the War of 1812, New England mariners settled and intermingled with the local people of this quaint Lowcountry port on the border between North and South Carolina. They set up various maritime enterprises and the village became a prosperous port in the 1850s, shipping lumber and naval stores to northern markets. Describing the village in 1868, "Waccamaw" wrote: "a flourishing commercial place, that bids fair to become of great importance in the industrial and commercial interest of Horry and of the adjoining counties in North Carolina....Vessels of one hundred and fifty tons burden can come up to the village, and so make regular trips between this place and Northern cities, as well as to the West Indies."[3] Sailing to Atlantic ports, north or south, was easier than journeying westward overland to Columbia.

During the latter half of the nineteenth century when earning a living in rural New England became increasingly difficult, well-traveled seafarers found it easier to pick up stakes and settle in familiar south Atlantic ports, or along the California coast than to travel overland.[4] After the Civil War, Maine suffered, as did much of New England, a severe drain of its population, many going "out West or out South." During stops at Little River aboard the schooner Lillias, Captain Joseph Griffin of Stockton Springs, Maine met several enterprising New Englanders. In the early 1870's when shipping and shipbuilding were extremely slow on Penobscot Bay, Captain Griffin considered moving his wife and family to Little River where he hoped to make a better living than he did coasting. In a letter to Joseph, Captain Isaac Griffin, Joseph's father, gave his approval implying that the rest of the family might "go out South" as well: "You wrote favorably of Little River. Well Joseph, any place along our coast would be pleasant and warm to me, if good health, and freedom from debt, and money enough to keep us easy could be our lot."[5] In contrast to the decline in shipping and shipbuilding along the Maine coast, South Carolina port towns were prospering from the commercial importance of naval stores. In 1872, Everett

Grant, a former shipmate and hometown friend of Captain Griffin encouraged him to relocate in Little River: "I don't wonder that you are about discouraged at going to sea, and wish you might avail yourself of the opportunity you speak of near Little River. I have no doubt but there is money to be made out of that country, and the man that has got a little spare cash and plenty of pluck is the man to go there."[6]

In the 1820s, more than forty years before Captain Griffin considered relocating in Little River, a vigorous lumber trade began between ports on Penobscot Bay and those in Horry and Georgetown counties when Henry Buck of Bucksport, Maine first settled southwest of Little River in what became Bucksville, South Carolina. Henry Buck, born in 1800, the grandson of Jonathan Buck who founded the lumbering town of Bucksport, Maine in 1743, came from a well-to-do family engaged in lumbering and shipbuilding on Maine's Penobscot Bay. Following the tradition of young men growing up along the Maine coast in the 1800's, Henry Buck probably arrived in South Carolina aboard ship as a young mariner.[7] Looking over the woodlands of Horry County, he decided to settle about fifty miles up the Waccamaw River from Georgetown to become a planter, lumberman, shipbuilder, and the largest slave-holder in the County.

An enterprising self-made man, Buck, borrowed two slaves from the wealthy rice planter Robert Alston (later governor of South Carolina). Together with his borrowed slaves he constructed a saw mill on the Waccamaw River and sold timber to a Maine schooner at a high price. As early as 1825, it is recorded that Henry purchased a slave named Brazzel for $700. His first business venture was a store three miles above Conway at Grissette's Landing, from which he started his operation. It is recorded that in 1837 Henry Buck purchased lands along the Waccamaw from a man named George W. Olney. There he and his sons built three saw mills which became world famous for their production of pine and cypress lumber.[8] The lumbering business was wide open for this pioneer who employed the economical and successful method, used by loggers on Maine's three major rivers, of floating raw logs down the river to his mills.[9]

In 1828, Buck built his home at Upper Mill Plantation. which has recently been restored by his great grandson and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.[10] Middle Mill was the largest and first steam-powered mill in South Carolina and was where the once lively community of Bucksville prospered. Upper and Middle Mills are marked today by two massive saw mill chimneys surrounded by woods, lone sentinels to Henry Buck's early timber empire along the Waccamaw River. The third mill, Buck's Lower Mill, was later built by his son, Henry Lee Buck at what is now present-day Bucksport, South Carolina, where a marina now stands on this isolated spot where the Waccamaw River interconnects with the Intracoastal Waterway.[11]

By 1850 Buck's mill was producing six and one-half million feet of sawed timber worth $73,000 with the aid of forty-two males, mostly slaves whom he had hired.[12] A resident born at Lower Mill, now Bucksport, S.C., in 1854 recounts how sharp, deep-bottomed coastal sailing vessels were required "to carry ballast when going light. This accounts for the piles of rocks along the river bank between here and Georgetown. Capt. Buck would charter a vessel in Maine and have them to go into Kennebeck (Kennebec) River and saw the ice in as large blocks as they could handle and get enough for ballast, and it cost him nothing."[13]

Supplying timber merchants of New England with a great deal of business, Henry Buck shipped lumber all over the globe. His lumber business gained an international reputation for supplying the shipyards of Maine and Massachusetts with yellow pine timber, used to build America's famous sailing ships. Captain William McGilvery of Searsport, Maine and Richard Pike Buck, founder of the prosperous shipping firm R.P. Buck & Co. of New York City, handled much of Henry Buck's shipping business.[14]

Maine sea captains, like Captain Edward Clifford of Stockton Springs, Maine, were responsible

for obtaining their own cargo at an advantageous price. In 1859, Captain Clifford unloaded his schooner the James Crosby in Charleston and waited to hear from Captain McGilvery about taking on lumber at Bucksport for a higher price than he was offered at Georgetown. In a letter to his wife he commented that business was "very dull here as well as at the North," perhaps because of the sessionist crisis and the overtones of a possible civil war. Feeling uncomfortable with the heat and humidity (bathing in rum to cool down), Captain Clifford complains of feeling lonely without his wife and family aboard.[15] Handling much of Henry Buck's shipping business with northern ports, Captain William McGilvery, born in Captain Edward Clifford's home town, probably extended his influence to aid other struggling Stockton sea captains to obtaining cargo at a fair price.[16]

In 1860, on the eve of the Civil War, James Roberts Gilmore, a New York publisher visited Horry District and found himself a guest of Captain Buck at his home on the banks of the Waccamaw. In his book Among the Pines, published under the pseudonym of "Edmund Kirke," Gilmore identifies Henry Buck as "Captain B--." The following quote describes this downeast Yankee's ambitious enterprise amongst the Carolina pines:

> He was born at the North and his career affords a striking illustration of the marvelous enterprise of our northern character. A native of the state of Maine, he immigrated thence as a young man and settled down amid the pine forests in that sequestered part of cottondom, erecting a small saw mill and a log shanty to shelter himself and a few hired Negroes. He attacked with his own hands the mighty pine, whose brothers still tower in gloomy magnificence around his dwelling. From such beginnings, he had risen to be one of the wealthiest land and slave owners of his district with vessels trading to nearly every quarter of the globe, to the northern and eastern ports, Cadiz, the West Indies, South America, and if I remember right, California. It seemed to me a marvel that this man alone and unaided by the usual appliances of commerce had created a business rivaling in extent the transactions of many a princely merchant of New York and Boston.[17]

Although Gilmore was opposed to slavery, he gave a favorable description of the management and care of Henry Buck's slaves:

> His "family" of slaves numbered about three hundred, and a more healthy, and to all appearance, happy set of laboring people, I had never seen. Well-fed, comfortably and almost neatly clad, with tidy and well-ordered homes, exempt from labor in childhood and advanced age, and cared for in sickness by a kind and considerate mistress, who is the physician and good Samaritan of the village, they seemed to share as much physical enjoyment as ordinarily falls to the lot of the "hewer of wood and drawer of water." Looking at them, I began to question if Slavery is, in reality, the damnable thing that some untravelled philanthropists have pictured it.[18]

In 1847 a correspondent, signed "Winyah," writing to the Farmer's Gazette concerning the economic slump of Georgetown chastised the local rice planters for their indifference to local affairs, mainly improving the Georgetown Harbor. "Southern apathy was much in evidence in Georgetown," the letter writer argued. "Although we are southern born, southern all over...yet, really it would be gratifying to see a considerable mixture of Yankee energy and enterprise infused in our people of the genial South." He further comments on what could be accomplished through "northern energy" citing how Henry Buck from Maine had had great success with his lumber mills on the Waccamaw River and had "amassed a

princely fortune, and drives now a successful and heavy trade with the West Indies."[19]

Not until Henry Buck set up his steam saw mills in the 1830's on the lower Waccamaw River in Horry District did lumber become a major portion of Georgetown's pre-Civil War trade. This growth of lumber and naval stores industries in the 1830s to 1850s was an important development in the economic life of Georgetown, whose trade had gone stagnant due to the steamboat and the railroad. Buck's mills were responsible for the increased number of vessels using Georgetown at this time. During a two-year period, in the late 1830s, fifty-two vessels sailed from Bucksport and at one time in January 1848 there were twenty-eight vessels loading there. On November 8, 1845, the Winyah Observer listed eleven vessels, nine brigs, one schooner, and one sloop at Bucksville loading lumber bound for northern and West Indian ports. Bucksville's growing importance as a shipping center created friction with Georgetown. In the 1840s when Henry Buck and others petitioned Congress to make Bucksville a port of entry, it was not approved but made a port of delivery instead. Charleston, Georgetown and other South Carolina ports, fearing the competition, were in firm opposition to Buckville becoming an official port of entry.[20]

J.E. Beatty of Conway described the settlement of nineteenth-century Bucksville in an article submitted to The Horry Herald in 1952 entitled "Bucksville Busy Town in 1883":

> This is quite a busy little place, 700 inhabitants beautifully situated on Waccamaw River, 10 miles from Conway. This is the chief shipping point of Conway C.H., as well as a large area of back country. Naval stores, timber and cotton are the main shipments, which are so extensive that a regular line of three vessels are employed to ply between this point and New York to carry naval stores, each having a capacity of about 3,000 barrels; also a line of schooners to Baltimore, of 400 and 500 barthen each, and to carry away the lumber, it takes from forty to fifty vessels, some trading at the north, others with the West Indies and South America. Bucksville has three churches, several private schools, two hotels and several saw mills. Mails daily by stage from Fair Bluff, N.C. semi-weekly by steamer from Georgetown, and tri-weekly by steamer from Conway, C.H.[21]

Another correspondent reminisced in an article sent to the Horry Herald in 1909 that the hamlets of Conwayborough and Bucksville were the only two settlements in nineteenth-century Horry County of any commercial importance. The correspondent added that "In education, refinement and culture Bucksville was perhaps considerably in advance of `The Buro,' as well as in the number of inhabitants."[22] The growth of Bucksville into a prosperous timber boom town, not only fostered an economic interchange between North and South, but introduced traditional educational and cultural values of New England into the remote region of the Waccamaw River. A number of intermarriages occurred between visiting Mainers, Buck family children, and local residents, further strengthening ties between citizens of Maine and those of Horry District.

In 1838, Henry married Frances Norman of Conwayborough and together they had seven children between 1838 and 1854. His eldest son and daughter, William L. Buck and Mary Jane Buck, from his previous Maine marriage came south to live with their father at the Bucksville plantation.[23] Mary Jane, who was born in Maine in 1830 and died childless in 1912, first married Henry Bell (who died) and then married Louis Sarvis, both from South Carolina. William L., who was born in Maine in 1828, married Desiah McGilvery, the daughter of Captain William McGilvery, the wealthy, well-known shipbuilder of Searsport, Maine. This marriage furthered strengthened the nineteenth-century bonds Henry Buck had

forged between Penobscot Bay shipbuilding interests and the South Carolina timber industry.

A few well-to-do families in the area, among them the Bucks, engaged young, educated women from good New England families, especially from the state of Maine to come to Horry district to teach their children privately. They were highly esteemed by the people in Horry, sometimes teaching other children in the community as well as the Buck children. Some of the young men of the county, considering them desirable mates, courted them with some success.[24]

Mary Brookman, a cousin of Henry Buck, born in Bucksport, Maine in 1825, came South in 1849 to tutor Henry Buck's children. After two years, she returned to her home in Maine, only to be followed there by Thomas Beaty, an eligible son of the prominent Beaty family, who was successful in winning Mary's hand in marriage. The couple returned to live in Conwayborough where a house was built for them by ships' carpenters from Maine who came south to work for the Bucks at nearby Bucksville. Mary Brookman Beaty out-lived her husband and all her children, and, like many of Maine's downeast women who were accustomed to managing affairs at home while their husbands were at sea, managed her husband's various businesses after his death in 1886.[25]

In the 1870s, Sarah Delano, who had taught school near her home in coastal Castine, Maine as well as in Illinois, was employed as governess and teacher to the children of William L. Buck and Desiah McGilvery Buck. She taught the children of other nearby families and made a favorable impression in the neighborhood. After Sarah had returned to Maine, James Elkanah Dusenbury, a widow for two years and a prominent citizen of Horry county, fondly remembered the Maine school teacher and traveled to Maine to court "the devout and industrious Sarah Delano." They were married in 1884 at Sarah's sister's home in Abbott, Maine, returning after the wedding to James Dusenbury's home in Socastee where Sarah took up her duties as stepmother to his nine children.[26] Fostina Hichborn, Desire McGilvery Buck's cousin and a teacher from Stockton Springs, Maine was listed in the 1880 Horry County Census as teacher/boarder. This later author of the town history of Stockton Springs, Maine probably came to Bucksville to teach William and Desire's children.[27]

Besides school teachers, Henry Buck brought numerous skilled workmen from Maine to Bucksville for short periods of time and some remained as permanent residents. The 1850 census for Horry County shows seven people, besides the Bucks, who were born in Maine: besides Mary Brookman, the teacher, were two merchants, two farmers, a blacksmith, and a carpenter. In 1860 there were still five Mainers, four in 1870, and ten in 1880---merchants, sailors, laborers, and saw mill workers.[28] In 1858, Henry Buck brought several carpenters from Maine to work for him. One, a Mr. Otis Eaton was a master mechanic and carpenter, who brought his wife and little boy to live in Bucksville until the Civil War broke out. Henry Buck gave his skilled Maine help his carpenter slaves, and together they accomplished an amazing amount of work in about nine months. They repaired the mill, built a two-story barn, about twenty four-room slave cabins, and an ice house at Lower Mill. After building the Hebron Church at Bucksville, they then built the Presbyterian Church in Conway. Next the crew built a house for William Henry Buck, a merchant in Conwayborough and one for Thomas Beaty and his wife, Mary Brookman Beaty. All of the party except Mr. Eaton, Sr., who died and was buried in the Presbyterian yard, returned to the North just after the Civil War broke out.[29]

Hebron is one of the oldest churches of the coastal area, originally a log church, across from which the Buck family bought a plot of land and began a family graveyard. The present church was built about 1848 at a cost of $1700, half of which was given by Henry Buck and one-eighth by his son William L. Buck. The doors, windows, blinds and the pulpit of solid Honduras Mahogany were given by Captain William McGilvery. The Bible was a gift of Captain Cephas Gilbert[30] and the communion silver and its carrying case was a gift of an unknown sea captain. The material, including the sand and brick from Cape Cod, was brought from the North in sailing ships, down the Atlantic coast and then up the Waccamaw to

Bucksport or to the Bucks' Sawmill Landing. The finish work was done by ship's carpenters under the supervision of carpenters from Maine.[31]

Until the secession crisis, Horry District was predominately unionist, dependent as it was on the northern timber trade. With the coming of the Civil War, Horry citizens were split in their loyalties, and this division expressed itself within the Buck family. Gilmore, in describing his 1860 visit to the Buck's plantation, records a conversation between Henry Buck and an aristocratic Georgetown rice planter (referred to as the "Colonel" and probably an Alston as he was identified as a relative to Theodosia Burr's husband). Discussing "urgent times" when Union troops were stationed at Charleston harbor, Captain Buck expressed his unionist sentiments in his debate with a leader of the secessionist movement. As a Maine native doing business with Northern seaports, Henry Buck opposed the threatened Civil War and secession, despite his status as the county's largest slave owner. However, his two sons born in South Carolina were ardent secessionists and volunteered to fight for the Confederacy.[32]

According to Gilmore, once South Carolina seceded, Henry Buck gave as much as $40,000 to the Confederate cause as penalties for his unionism. In addition, five Buck vessels were seized in Northern ports because they were Southern owned, and Henry Buck's assets on the Waccamaw River decreased from $1,000,000. in 1860 to $1,000. in 1870.[33] However, Henry Buck was influential in seeing that predominately Maine Soldiers were stationed in Horry District during Reconstruction. General George L. Beal commanded the troops in Horry County which included the Fifteenth and Twenty-Ninth Maine regiments and the First Maine Battalion. A member of the Twenty-Ninth Maine recorded his impression of Georgetown upon his arrival on June 15: "This old town, with its ancient church and other reminders of revolutionary days, had been pretty well cleared out by sword and fire. The people are poor as death, almost starved, poorly clad, and with pale, cadaverous expressions."[34]

In 1870 Henry Buck died at the age of seventy in Saratoga Springs, New York where he had gone for his health, which had been feeble for some time. His body was returned to the South and interred in the family cemetery across from Hebron Church near Bucksville. Henry Buck's eldest son, William L. Buck, took over the family business and continued the family tradition of public service.[35] The "Biographical Directory of the Senate of the State of South Carolina, 1776-1974" gives sketches of three Bucks who were South Carolina senators: the first Captain Henry Buck, his son William L. by his first marriage, and his grandson, Henry Lee, Jr.[36]

The three mills that Henry Buck and his sons built along the Waccamaw River became world famous for their production of pine and cypress lumber. After Henry Buck's death in 1870, his sons took over the saw mill business and resumed shipping lumber all over the world. By 1880 some of the Buck assets were regained through the energetic business endeavors of his sons and a boom in the market for naval stores in the 1870s.[37] During the 1880's, Henry Buck's oldest son Captain Henry Lee Buck, together with Captain Frank Rogers of Florence, South Carolina, planted the first crop of tobacco grown in Horry County and perhaps the first tobacco barn for curing in South Carolina. This started a large tobacco industry in Horry County which was said, with the exception of one North Carolina county, to be the largest crop of bright leaf tobacco ever grown in the United States.[38]

In 1874, a brief period of shipbuilding on a grand scale began at Bucksville and ended with the construction of the largest wooden ship ever built in South Carolina, the Henrietta.[39] Henry Buck was influential in convincing northern ship-builders of the superior quality of southern timber. Although a part owner of a number of Maine-built ships, Henry Buck died before shipbuilding at Bucksville began.[40] However, the relationship between the Buck family and Captain McGilvery, the Searsport, Maine shipbuilder, was largely responsible for Bucksville's shipbuilding era from 1873 to 1875. Because large ships could not be built at Searsport, Maine due to the shallow Penobscot River, McGilvery decided to move his shipbuilding enterprise to Bucksville using Searsport ship wrights.

In the fall of 1874, McGilvery and another Maine shipbuilder, Captain Jonathan C. Nickels, sent master shipbuilder Elisha Dunbar with a crew of skilled craftsmen from New England to Bucksville to build a three-masted schooner, the Hattie McGilvery Buck. With the success of this first shipbuilding endeavor, McGilvery, Nickels and William L. Buck built the 1,400 ton Henrietta, launched in April 1875. The Henrietta was so large that it was with great difficulty that she was "warped" down the river to Georgetown and on to Charleston where she was fitted with masts. She never returned to either Georgetown or Charleston as she drew too much water for their harbors. The lack of a large number of local skilled workmen, the difficulty in launching a large ship after she was completed, and the disputed higher costs of shipbuilding in the area, ended Bucksville's shipbuilding experiment.[41]

Henry Buck not only left a legacy of vigorous trade and industry in Horry District, but he left a community of Bucks on opposite ends of his nineteenth-century trade route, who continue to this day to be in contact with one another. Like his great grandfather Jonathan Buck, who founded a lumbering town on the wilderness shores of Penobscot Bay, the enterprising and industrious Henry Buck fostered community in the low-country wilderness of South Carolina. During a period of sectional crisis, this pioneering lumberman expanded and connected the port communities of Penobscot Bay and Low Country South Carolina. On the lonely banks of the Waccamaw, the businesses, churches, and homes, that he and other Mainers helped to build are all silent now and marked only by a strange lonely sentinel standing watch over the once busy shore. The Maine-South Carolina link remains visible in the local cemetery in Bucksville where Henry Buck's monument rests between his southern descendants on one side and those of his Yankee offspring and relatives on the other--symbolizing, perhaps, the split the Civil War had caused in the family. The descendants of Henry Buck's former slaves still populate the nearby countryside and Buck family descendants come from all over the country to renew their Maine-South Carolina ties in reunion.[42] They celebrate what once was a vibrant, prosperous community connecting the peoples of North and South at opposite ends of a historical trade route.

The nineteenth-century economic and social interconnection between Maine and South Carolina port towns served as a valuable historic model for the creation of the "New South" Creed of industrialization and diversification in Horry County, South Carolina. The familiarity of Horry District citizens with the social, cultural, and economic ways of New Englanders may have eased the transition from Civil War hostilities through Reconstruction to the establishment of a "New South." A number of Maine soldiers stationed with the occupation forces in the district married local girls and became citizens of the county after Reconstruction. Henry Buck's early introduction of Maine teachers to the district perhaps paved the way for the acceptance of northern teachers who went South during and after Reconstruction. One may also observe how this forging of energetic and enterprising Maine values with Lowcountry congeniality and hospitality have been influential in establishing the groundwork for the booming twentieth-century tourist industry at nearby Myrtle Beach.

ENDNOTES

[1] According to William Hutchinson Rowe's The Maritime History of Maine (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1948): In 1860 there were 11,375 mariners in Maine (one-fifth of the state's population), and of the 759 ships' masters, half of these were "Cape Horners," pp. 286-298. According to Samuel Eliot Morison in The Maritime History of Massachusetts 1783-1860, 1921 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962) p. 370, Maine, not Massachusetts, kept American sailing ships afloat into the latter part of the nineteenth century.

[2] "Waccamaw," for The Marion Star, December 16, 1868 in Catherine H. Lewis', "Little River," Coastal Courier, series beginning Feb. 4, 1988; also in The Independent Republic Quarterly, 24, no. 4 (Fall 1992), 6-17.

[3] Ibid.

[4] So many New England sea captains in the oriental trade settled with their families in Oakland, California that the town became known as "the sea captain's bedroom." On the subject of the Maine exodus in the nineteenth century see Gerald McFarland's A Scattered People.

[5] Ralph Griffin, ed., Letters of a New England Coaster, (privately published, 1968), 35.

[6] Ibid, Everett Grant to Joseph Griffin, 4 March 1872, p. 246.

[7] William and George Buck, two of Henry Buck's older brothers, were owners of two schooners built at Bucksport, Maine; the Experiment (built in 1817) and the Mary Eliza (built in 1823). William H. Pendleton and Eugenia Buck Cutts, "More Light on Bucksport from a New England Historian," Independent Republic Quarterly, Pendleton letter written March 13, 1977.

[8] Eugenia Buck Cutts, "Industry in Bucksport, S.C.," Independent Republic Quarterly, 3, no. 1, (1969): 31-33; Charles Joyner, "Henry Buck," an unpublished essay written for the Buck family reunion, May 7, 1993.

[9] The famous log drives on Maine's Penobscot, Kennebec, and Androscoggin Rivers brought about a unique lifestyle documented in a historical film entitled "From Stump to Ship."

[10] To the left of the house stands the remains of the smokestack of the first of three lumber mills built by the Buck family. This mill and surrounding land were called Upper Mill because it was the most northern of the three sawmills. The property has remained in the Buck family since 1828. The Independent Republic Quarterly, Vol.3, no. 3, July, 1969, p. 25.

[11] Eugenia Buck Cutts, "Industry in Bucksport, S.C.," Independent Republic Quarterly, 3, no. 1, (1969): 31-33; Catherine Lewis, "Buck Founded Family on Carolina Forests," The Sun News, Myrtle Beach, S.C., March 14, 1992. "Lonely Sentinel Marks Buck(s)ville," The State, Columbia, S.C., 1966. "Down Easters Renew Ties Down South," The Republican Journal, Belfast, Maine, May 5, 1983.

[12] Eugenia Buck Cutts, "Industry in Bucksport, S.C.," Independent Republic Quarterly, 3, no. 1, (1969): 31-33.; Charles Joyner, "Henry Buck," an unpublished essay written for the Buck family reunion, May 7, 1993.

[13] "Interesting Bits of History," The Horry Herald, December 30, 1926, submitted by Herbert Hucks, Jr., Archivist, Wofford College, Spartanburg, S.C., grandson of the writer, Independent Republic Quarterly, 3, no. 1: p. 4. Eugenia Buck Cutts, Henry Buck's great-great granddaughter, commented that he had the first ice house in the county, Cutts, "Industry in Bucksport, S.C., 1968.

[14] William H. Pendleton and Eugenia Buck Cutts, "More Light on Bucksport from a New England Historian,"

Independent Republic Quarterly, Pendleton letter written March 13, 1977. The 1878 obituary of Captain McGilvery reveals that he was born in 1814 at Stockton Springs and moved to Searsport at about the age of forty, when he retired from the sea as commander of the brig Harriet H. McGivery in 1851. His obituary also relates the details of his gruesome death by suicide, The Republican Journal, Belfast, Maine, 1876.

[15] Letter written by Henry Edward Clifford in port of Charleston, S.C. aboard the schooner James Crosby, to his wife Henrietta Blanchard Clifford in Stockton Springs, Maine, (village just north of Searsport on Penobscot Bay) April 11, 1859, Stockton Springs Historical Society, Stockton Springs, Me. Maine women married to sea captains frequently traveled aboard ship with their husbands taking their younger children along as well. See Constance Fournier's "Navigating Women: Exploring the Roles of Nineteenth-Century New England Sailing Wives," in Maine History, Vol. 35, 1 & 2, Summmer-Fall 1995. For a specific discussion of seafaring families of Penobscot Bay see "Home Folks: Maritime Couples of Penobscot Bay Sustain Family and Community Ashore and At Sea in the Nineteenth Century" being published in an anthology of Maine Women's History by the University of Maine Press and the Margaret Chase Library.

[16] Born in Stockton, Springs, a village just a few miles north of Searsport on Penobscot Bay, William McGilvery met and married Harriet Hichborn, the daughter of a prominent sea captain. He built a fine mansion amongst the many that gracefully lined the main street of Searsport, a town that produced scores of sea captains in the nineteenth century.

[17] Edmund Kirke (James Roberts Gilmore), Among the Pines, or, the South in Secession Time (New York, 1862), 31.

[18] Ibid, 31-32

[19] Ronald E. Bridwell, `...That We Should have a Port...': A History of the Port of Georgetown, South Carolina, 1732-1865, (Georgetown, S.C., 1982), p. 43.

[20] Ibid, p. 45. Maritime historian Rusty Fleetwood wrote that "The major ports of Charleston, Savannah, and Jacksonville shipped out their share, but ports like Georgetown in South Carolina, and Darien and St. Mary's in Georgia fairly exploded with the boom, and were crammed with vessels all out of proportion to their size, Fleetwood, p. 129.

[21] J.E. Beatty, P.M., "Bucksville Busy Town in 1883, submitted by Mrs. Florece Sarvis Pinner of Bucksville and Washington, D.C. to the The Horry Herald, Feb.21, 1952.

[22] "Horry," Horry Herald, October 21, 1909, reprinted in The Independent Republic Quarterly.

[23] Henry Buck had been married in Maine to Mary Clark Buck before coming to South Carolina. They had two children, William L. Buck (1828-1880) and Mary Jane Buck (1830-1912), who left Maine to live with their father after his divorce from his Maine wife. Buck Family Geneology, Richard Pike Buck Library, Searsport, Maine, p. 85.

[24] Catherine H. Lewis, "The Good Stepmother," Sun News, March 9, 1996.

[25] Catherine H. Lewis, "A Northern Lady With Some Peculiarities," Sun News, May 4, 1991. This essay recounts the tragedy of the drowning of Mary and Thomas Beaty's daughters, followed shortly after by the death of their only son, a well-known story in Horry County. The graves of Cora and Freddie can be seen at Kingston Presbyterian Cemetery, a short distance from the lake where they drowned. The glass enclosed recumbent statue appears to be two little girls entwined in each other's arms.

[26] Catherine H. Lewis, "The Good Stepmother," Sun News, March 9, 1996.

[27] U.S. Census, Population Schedules, 1880, Horry County Courthouse.

[28] U.S. Census, Manuscript Population Schedules, 1850-1880.

[29] Herbert Hucks, "Interesting Bits of History." Miss Sally Dow of Searsport, Maine, granddauaghter of Otis Eaton, recalled her mother telling her of the difficulties the Eaton's and other people brought to Bucksville by the Bucks had in getting North after the bombardment of Fort Sumter. Correspondence of William Pendleton to Eugenia Buck Gutts, March 13, 1977.

[30] A Massachusetts mariner who married Lucinda Buck, William and Desire McGilvery Buck's daughter.

[31] Bertha Paul Staley, "Churches of Toddville, Bucksville, and Bucksport," Independent Republic Quarterly, 2, no. 4 (1968): 9-11.

[32] Henry Lee Buck became Captain of A. Co., 26th South Carolina Regiment (Volunteers) Army of the Confederate States. He was captured at the Battle of Fort Steadman and was imprisoned at Fort Delaward. After the war he served as a major of a cavalry batallion in the State Militia. Henry Buck's second son, Lietenant George O. Buck died of disease contracted in a military camp. Cutts-Pendleton correspondence, p. 30; Joyner, "Henry Buck," p. 7.

[33] Gilmore, p. 36 in a footnote writes that Henry Buck had been "onerously assessed" by Secession leaders "for contribuitons for carrying on the war. The sum he has been forced to pay is stated as high as forty thousand dollars, but that may be, and I trust is, an exaggeration." See also Henry Buck's decrease in income as documented in the U.S. Census, Population Schedules, 1860 and 1870.

[34] Bridwell, The Gem of the Atlantic Seaboard, p. 7. According to local historian Catherine Lewis, who proved to be invaluable with her wealth of information on the Buck family and Horry County history, Henry Buck was influential in insuring that young Maine farm boys would serve as occupation forces in Conwayborough during the Reconstruction era. As a result, many settled in the area and married local women. See Franklin Burroughs, Horry and the Waccamaw (Norton, 1992).

[35] Buck Family Geneology, p. 62; Joyner, "Henry Buck;" Catherine Lewis, "Buck Founded Family on Carolina Forests," The Sun News, Myrtle Beach, S.C., March 14, 1992.

[36] Pendleton & Cutts Correspondence, March 26, 1977.

[37] Ibid; Joyner, "Henry Buck."

[38] In 1898, D.V. Richardson from Whiteville, North Carolina, set up a cypress shingle operation at Bucksport. He was the first man in Horry County to abandon rafting of logs down the river, and built the first railway into the inaccessible swamp area which greatly increased production. Mr. Richardson met and married the daughter of Captain Buck, Miss Jessamine Buck, who when she returned to her birthplace, the Negro descendents of grandfather's slaves thought that she "had been sent from the Lord to look after them, as the `old Missie' had. Cutts, "Industry In Bucksport, S.C.," 32-33.

[39] "Ship Henrietta," The Independent Republic Quarterly, Vol. 2, no. 3, July 1958, pp. 24-24; "Boat Built At Bucksvill in 1875," The Independent Republic Quarterly, Vol 2, No. 2, April 1968, p. 3; Ronald E. Bridwell, "The Gem of the Atlantic Seaboard: Georgetown, South Carolina."(Georgetown, 1991), 13.

[40] In 1851, Henry Buck owned jointly with R.P. Buck of New York, Charles Buck of Boston, and others, brig Lillian built at Bucksport, Maine. Buck was part owner, along with William McGilvery, of the bark Henry Buck built at Searsport, Maine in 1852, and reported to have been one of the first Maine-built vessels to use southern pine in her frame. Also the Winyah, constructed at Bucksport, Me. in 1854 had a South Carolina connection and was probably partly owned by Buck. He later owned in partnership with R.P. Buck, the bark Hudson, also built at Bucksport, Me., Ronald E. Bridwell, "The Gem of the Atlantic Seaboard: Georgetown, South Carolina."(Georgetown, 1991), 13.

[41] Bridwell, The Gem of the Atlantic Seaboard, (1991), 13-15; Cutts, "Industry in Bucksport," 32; "Ship Henrietta," Independent Republic Quarterly, 2, no. 3, (1958): 23-24. Many believed that northern shipbuilders feared southern competion. Bridwell writes about the contraversy over the the cost of shipbuilding in the South as opposed to New England: "Many northern journals,...., mention the Bucksville venture; but, according to "Bucksville," the author of a letter published in the Horry News on May 29, 1875, `not one northern paper, out of many that have commented upon shipbuilding here, has spoken favorably of the enterprise.'"

[42] "Down Easters Renew Ties Down South," The Republican Journal. Belfast, Maine, May 5, 1983.

Charleston's French Revolutionary Consul: Michel-Ange--Bernard de Mangourit, 1792-1794

Michel-Ange-Bernard de Mangourit's tenure as French consul in Charleston was a very eventful one-and-a-half years. He was the representative of a government in France that was determined to spread revolution into the colonial holdings of its European rivals. When this government fell, its foreign policy objectives were repudiated and its representatives were recalled. Despite having been recalled and given scant resources with which to carry out his objectives, Mangourit persevered until the last moment. However, Mangourit was not merely stubborn. He saw the benefits to France of spreading the French Revolution in the New World. He truly was a "revolutionary republican."

Mangourit was born on 21 August 1752 in Rennes, near the English Channel in Brittany.[1] Like so many provincial lawyers, Mangourit was drawn to Paris in late 1788 by the nascent revolution. After serving in the National Assembly and being certified by that body as a "conqueror" of the Bastille, Mangourit was appointed Consul of France for North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia by Louis XVI on 2 March 1792. In May, Mangourit, his wife, and two children sailed from Le Havre. On 1 September 1792, the Mangourit family arrived at Charleston.[2]

Early in his mission to Charleston, Mangourit showed signs of an active approach to politics. As early as September 1792, the consul began working on a project to raise a force of frontier riflemen for transport to France. Mangourit also made contact with local authorities in South Carolina, including Governor William Moultrie.[3]

In April 1793, the arrival of Edmond Charles Genet as the new minister plenipotentiary thrust the French consul at Charleston into the center of a new French diplomatic offensive. Mangourit's later activities took place against the background of events in Paris, Philadelphia, and the French colony of St. Domingue.

In St. Domingue (modern-day Haiti), a slave revolt erupted in 1791. Refugees, many of them white planters, began pouring into the major port cities of the United States. The government in France attempted, in various ways, to control events in the colony, but the revolt kept snowballing. About the same time that Mangourit arrived in Charleston, a new three-man commission, led by *Commissaire Civil* Sonthonax, arrived in the troubled colony.

The commissions' attempts to bring equal rights to all inhabitants merely polarized the colony. The revolution continued out of control in St. Domingue. The colony was irrevocably lost by 1802, largely due to the French Republic's egalitarian principles. Many of these principles were enunciated in 1792 by Jacques-Pierre Brissot de Warville, one of the founders of the abolitionist Societe des Amis des Noirs. Brissot was also one of the leaders of the ruling French faction.[4]

Brissot's group of moderate republicans, known as the Girondins, were in control of the French Convention. In September 1792, the Girondins were largely responsible for the dissolution of the French monarchy in favor of a republic. Although their domestic policy was conservative, the Girondins' foreign policy was radical, aggressive, and based on the idea of exporting the French Revolution.[5] Already at war with most of Europe, the Girondins expected to add Spain and Britain to their list of adversaries. They hoped that the United States, with its plentiful resources and merchant fleet, could help supply France. Although the Girondins did not want to pull the United States into a European war, they hoped that American aid could be enlisted to export revolution to the colonies of Britain and Spain.[6]

To put their policies into action, the Girondins chose Genet as their minister plenipotentiary to the United States in November 1792. Genet's objectives were extensive and sometimes contradictory. One of the most glaring contradictions in the instructions was that, while strengthening relations with the United States, Genet was also ordered to spread revolution into Florida, Louisiana and Canada. The minister was to recruit American citizens to undertake these operations whether or not the American government approved. To this

end, the Girondins gave Genet 250 blank officer commissions for the expeditions, and about the same number of blank letters of marque to commission privateers. If all went well, France would have a diversion to use against Britain and Spain.[7]

On the same day that Louis XVI was executed (21 January 1793), Genet departed Paris for Rochefort, France. Having defended the king, the Girondins were discredited. The political momentum in France swung in favor of the Jacobins. From September 1793 through July 1794, Genet and the French consuls in the United States dealt with the Jacobin-dominated government of Terror. Genet sailed for America on board the French frigate *l'Embuscade* at the end of February 1793.

On 8 April 1793, the new minister arrived in Charleston to a warm reception. Mangourit introduced the minister to local dignitaries, including Governor Moultrie.[8] Genet made use of the French letters of marque by commissioning privateers and recruiting sailors during his stay in Charleston. Within a week, four privateers had been commissioned and one had put out to sea. Meanwhile, *l'Embuscade* took English merchantmen as prizes and sent them into Charleston.[9]

The minister gave the consul some of the letters of marque, along with some blank army commissions. Genet ordered Mangourit to prepare to spread revolution into Louisiana and East and West Florida. When word reached Charleston of the 7 March 1793 French declaration of war against Spain, the consul was ready and willing to put his instructions into action.[10]

On the same day that Genet arrived in Charleston, news about the execution of Louis XVI and the French declaration of war on Britain reached much of the United States. President Washington ordered Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson to offer Genet a cool reception when the French minister arrived in mid-May 1793. Washington quickly decided upon a policy of strict neutrality regarding the war in Europe. The outfitting of French privateers and the recruiting of American sailors became a sore point between the minister and the Washington administration. By June 1793, the American cabinet had decided to put an end to further commissioning and arming of French vessels in American ports. As a result, the French consuls were left with a very limited number of ships with which to implement the grand schemes of the Girondins.[11]

Another issue that hurt Franco-American relations involves the debt owed to France by the United States as a result of French aid during the American Revolution. On 11 June, President Washington refused Genet's request for advances on the debt. The refusal put Genet in a bad position. He had been instructed to gain advances on the debt to pay for the activities against Britain and Spain. All of Genet's projects, including those entrusted to Mangourit, remained in desperate need of money.

By the end of July 1793, the American cabinet had decided to demand Genet's recall because of his violations of American neutrality. Even the pro-French Jefferson agreed that Genet should be recalled. Rather than trying to mend fences with Jefferson, Genet accused the Secretary of State of betraying him. From September 1793 to Genet's replacement by Joseph Fauchet in late-February 1794, relations between Genet and the Washington administration deteriorated. Meanwhile, in France, the Girondins had fallen and the Jacobins had taken control of French politics. By early June 1793, the Girondin ministers, including Brissot, had been arrested. The Girondins were blamed for everything that had gone wrong in France during their tenure in office. Genet, as their minister in America, was an easy target, and in mid-October the Committee of Public Safety voted to recall him.

Had Genet been adept at the diplomatic arts of subtlety and stalling and had he been more successful in Philadelphia, the expeditions that had been entrusted to Mangourit might have come to pass. As matters now stood, it had become a race against recall. It was a race the consul was bound to lose. Also instrumental in the ultimate failure of Mangourit's mission were the groups in Charleston which were opposed to the French Revolution. These groups included not only France's traditional enemies, the British, but also counter-revolutionary Frenchmen. Opposed by a large number of people of his own nationality, it is hardly surprising that Mangourit's mission ended in failure.

However, "all is not lost," Mangourit asserted. According to the consul, France did have friends in South Carolina who were ready to aid the French cause. The consul lumped the friends of France into one class: the discontented (*mecontens*), who had been put off by the government and overlooked in the years following the American Revolution.[12] Mangourit was aware that the friends of France were allied with him for personal reasons, and hoped to reap personal rewards. Rather than being insulted by this, Mangourit thought that these personal motivations made his supporters more valuable.[13]

In Mangourit's estimation, the single most important French ally in South Carolina was Governor William Moultrie. According to Mangourit, the governor supported loosening Spain's grip on Louisiana. Moultrie was, to some degree, motivated by his interest in western land speculation.[14] Governor Moultrie's support of France was not unqualified; he was the governor of a state where the economy was dependent on slavery. Within the constraints of his political situation, however, he supported the French cause as much as he could.

Soon after Genet's departure, Moultrie encouraged Mangourit to visit American military officers and gave the consul letters of introduction to some of the leading citizens of Savannah, Georgia. Moultrie even suggested a plan of attack against the Spanish that the consul found impractical. Mangourit had no doubt about the governor's bravery, but doubted his abilities as a tactician, an impression that was soon to change.[15]

In August 1793, Governor Moultrie received a letter from the lieutenant governor of Virginia warning that a slave revolt assisted by black immigrants from St. Domingue was in the works to envelop the South beginning on 13 October. A supplier of arms for the slave revolt was reputedly based in Charleston. Rumors also suggested that Mangourit was this supplier. Mangourit knew that the refugee planters from St. Domingue had concocted these rumors to bring about a rupture between the consul and the governor.[16]

At the beginning of October, a group of military and civilian refugees from St. Domingue sailed into Charleston aboard the brig *Maria*. The leader of the refugees, Lieutenant Colonel G. Josnez, sent Mangourit letters requesting permission to come ashore and get supplies at Charleston. A few days after the arrival of the French brig, the governor visited Mangourit in an angry mood. Moultrie gave the consul a copy of one of Josnez's letters and demanded an explanation. The governor said that someone had told him that Mangourit was an operative of the *commissaires civils* of St. Domingue under orders to stir up the local slaves. In light of such serious charges, Moultrie asked to see the original letter. Mangourit contained his indignation at the "weakness of the old man." The consul realized that "it would be dangerous for me to indulge in an outburst when the good of our projects would require his accord with me."[17]

While protesting the violation of his correspondence, the consul suggested that Josnez be brought to the governor's residence, hand over the letter, and testify as to its contents in front of witnesses. Moultrie agreed and confirmed Mangourit's suspicions that a group of Frenchmen had delivered the letter to the governor's office. A day or so later, at the governor's house, Josnez surrendered the supposedly-damning letter to the consul and the governor. The letter was a harmless thank-you note to Mangourit for helping a Frenchman start a business in St. Domingue.[18]

Meanwhile, a group of deputies of a pro-British citizens' committee[19] showed up at the governor's house. One of the deputies, named Duborq, proposed to the governor that groups of French citizens form themselves into companies for the "safety of the city."[20] Moultrie diplomatically told Duborq that he could not raise a troop in Charleston. The consul appeared a little surprised at the governor's diplomatic dexterity. After searching Josnez's belongings, Moultrie was satisfied that the lieutenant colonel and his companions were not involved in any conspiracy. According to the consul, Moultrie was very decent to the lieutenant colonel. At the end of the interview, Moultrie embraced Josnez, "with tears in his eyes," and the soldier departed.[21]

Although the rumored slave revolt never took place and the consul's relations with Moultrie had not suffered, the consul decided to divulge only limited information about the invasion plans to Moultrie. "He

knows all," Mangourit wrote, "except that which, in good taste, Providence should hide from weak humans." Mangourit felt that he could count on the governor's help for the Louisiana mission. However, the consul neglected to mention plans to invade East Florida.[22]

Upon the consul's recall in April 1794, the consul and the governor exchanged farewells. Moultrie saw the consul as "a patriotic defender of the rights of your republic and a sincere friend of mine." Mangourit responded: "I will never forget your unshakable attachment to the cause of mankind."[23]

Other friends of France included the Republican Society of South Carolina. Formed in August 1793,[24] many of the Republican Society's 109 members, such as the president, Stephen Drayton, and the secretary, William Tate, were openly involved in Mangourit's schemes.[25] Mangourit's mission could not have progressed at all if it had not been for his allies, including Moultrie and Drayton.

Although France had many friends in South Carolina, there were also many enemies of the French Revolution in the state. As noted above, Mangourit was most directly opposed by two groups: the British and the French émigrés from St. Domingue. The British were a powerful group in Charleston; many Charleston merchants were either indebted to, or worked for, British concerns.[26] During Genet's stay in the city, British merchants were alarmed by the presence of *l'Embuscade* off the Charleston bar. Among these merchants was Edward Penman, who emerged as the leader of the British opposition, perhaps as a result of losing one of his ships to *l'Embuscade*.[27] Mangourit fingered Penman as the "secret and dangerous agent of England," to whom all anti-French activities could be traced.[28]

In 1793, Charleston's Benevolent Society was responsible for the relief of the émigrés. As one of the society's founding members, Edward Penman was in an excellent position to make contacts with the Domingan population of Charleston. The merchant often gave dinners for the émigrés. Such social occasions gave Penman and the Domingans the opportunity to make plans because, as the consul wrote, "during dessert one lifts up the veil of reserve."[29]

In September 1793, Penman was preparing a ship to sail for St. Domingue under the pretext of bringing aid to the distressed colonists.[30] Mangourit was suspicious that the ship's true purpose was to aid an invasion against the colonial government. Mangourit placed a spy on board the ship, and instructed his agent to alert the Domingan *commissaires civils*. By the end of the October 1793, the consul learned that the captain of the ship had been arrested by French colonial authorities. A large amount of mail had been seized, including "conspiratorial letters" from many French aristocrats in Charleston.[31]

The British and the Domingan aristocrats had a good reason to cooperate with each other: in August 1793, British forces invaded St. Domingue at Jeremie, about 100 miles west of Port-au-Prince. Aided by Domingan counterrevolutionaries, the British scored early successes. Mangourit reported a number of attempts to transport the Émigrés back to destabilize the government of St. Domingue.[32]

The British received a setback of their own in the early months of 1794. Rumors of war between Britain and the United States circulated in Charleston. Such rumors were fueled by the fact that British warships had begun seizing American vessels in the Caribbean. Anti-British sentiment in Charleston reached the boiling-point. Demonstrations against Britain and celebrations of solidarity with France increased. From this point to the end of Mangourit's mission in Charleston, the consul had neither the extra time nor the energy to combat or document any further British activities.[33]

At the same time that Charleston was reeling with anti-British excitement, the consul reported an upsurge of violence against the French "colonial aristocrats." When Mangourit first arrived in Charleston, he found that a number of Domingan aristocrats had formed a French Popular Society in 1792.[34] Around July 1793, the Haitian Revolution heated up and another wave of Domingan refugees sailed for American ports, the most prominent of whom was Jacques Delaire.[35] Delaire and many other Domingans joined the French Popular Society as an organ of opposition to the consul.[36]

During the slave revolt scare of October 1793, the Émigrés' active opposition to Mangourit reached a

peak. Mangourit believed that Émigrés, including Delaire, were behind rumors of the slave revolt as well as rumors that the consul was a supplier and supporter of the revolt.[37] When the *Maria* arrived in Charleston, the "colonial aristocrats" of St. Domingue took the opportunity to tie Mangourit closer to the rumored slave revolt. First, the Émigrés intercepted letters from the leader of the new arrivals, Lieutenant Colonel Josnez, to the consul. Then, they had the letters copied and given to Governor Moultrie. The governor was led to believe that these letters contained evidence of Mangourit's complicity in the expected slave revolt. Finally, the Émigrés called on the governor not to allow those on board *Maria* to land in Charleston, fearing that the soldiers might be loyal to Mangourit.[38]

How had the Émigrés managed to intercept the letters? Mangourit, with help from Lieutenant Colonel Josnez, came to the conclusion that the culprit was a prizemaster from St. Domingue under the command of Captain Carvin of the French corsair *l'Industrie*. This prizemaster, known as D. Saurine, had come to Josnez pretending to be on a mission from *Commissaire* Sonthonax of St. Domingue. Josnez handed the letters over to Saurine, only to find out later that the aristocrats had sent the prizemaster with the intention of providing the governor with a copy of the letters.[39]

The Domingans were only partially successful. *Maria* was quarantined and those aboard her were, for the most part, never allowed to land in Charleston. The Émigrés failed in their attempt to cause a rupture between Mangourit and Governor Moultrie. Mangourit believed that the city leaders never expected a revolt.[40]

This rumored slave revolt marks a change in the consul's attitude towards the colonial aristocrats as well as the corsair captains whom he had linked to the Émigrés through Saurine. No longer did he attempt to bring the Domingans into the revolutionary fold. He recognized them as intractable enemies of the Republic. He toyed with the idea of taking these "slanderers of the Republic" to court. He only regretted that the courts of the United States could not send these colonial aristocrats to the "guillotine francaise."[41] Additionally, Mangourit needed corsair captains he could trust if the invasion plans were to come to fruition.

In February 1794, with the East Florida expedition on the verge of beginning and rumors of Mangourit's and Genet's recall circulating, the émigrés returned to the offensive. Delaire even made charges of espionage against Mangourit.[42] The Domingans did not limit their attacks to Mangourit and Genet, however. No sooner had word of the recall arrived in Charleston than Delaire began to "rail against the new minister."[43]

During his mission in Charleston, the consul was able to contain the British and French opposition, even though much of his energy and most of the consulate's money were going towards the invasion projects. As a sign of the consul's success, Moultrie's support of Mangourit remained strong, despite Domingan propaganda. Of course, the governor was aware that Mangourit was tirelessly working to implement plans to invade Spanish possessions. The success of the projected invasions would not only benefit Moultrie personally, because of his speculation in western land, but also benefit the state of South Carolina by removing both the Spanish and their Native American allies from the American frontier.

One of the primary French contributions to the projected invasions was supposed to be naval assistance. Mangourit was largely on his own to procure some kind of flotilla. Most of the privateers that Genet and Mangourit had armed in 1793 were neutralized by either the American judicial system or British naval units.[44] The consul now needed ships with valid French commissions.

During the three months after Genet left Charleston, at least two other French privateers dropped anchor in Charleston harbor. Both captains held commissions from St. Domingue. Probably the first to arrive was the schooner *l'Industrie*, commanded by Jean-Baptiste Carvin. Shortly afterwards came the schooner *la Sans Pareille*, under the command of Jean Bouteille.[45]

Bouteille and Carvin both rendered themselves suspect of being aristocrats during the October 1793 rumored slave revolt. Saurine, the interceptor of consular correspondence, was a member of Carvin's crew.

In addition to this, Lieutenant Colonel Josnez accused both Bouteille and Carvin of planning a project to transport French aristocrats to St. Domingue to aid the British invasion. To gain more information, the consul placed a spy aboard Bouteille's ship and let the captains know that anyone trying to go to St. Domingue to aid the British would be arrested and deported.[46] The consulate still needed at least one vessel on which Mangourit could rely.

At the beginning of January 1794, the corvette *de Las Casas* arrived at Charleston from St. Domingue. Mangourit seized the opportunity to bring the ship under the consulate's control and remarked that "this corvette can be a great help for St. Augustine." However, before the corvette could be of any use, Mangourit had to overcome tensions between the crew and the officers of *de Las Casas*. The horrors of the revolution in St. Domingue had severely divided the crew.[47]

Mangourit was soon locked into a propaganda war with "colonial aristocrats," who told the crew that Mangourit was going to order the ship back to St. Domingue to face more revolutionary horrors. The consul barely managed to keep the crew from open revolt. In addition to making rousing revolutionary speeches and orchestrating the patriotic funeral of one of the crewmen, Mangourit gave orders for the ship's repair. Lastly, when the French seamen got into an altercation at a local theater, Mangourit defended the sailors and bailed them out of jail.[48]

Mangourit's efforts paid off. Despite the fact that Genet's replacement, Joseph Fauchet, ordered Mangourit to have *de Las Casas* sail north to protect a grain convoy, the corvette sailed for the St. Mary's River at the end of March. On 9 April, only *de Las Casas* and an unnamed schooner anchored near the mouth of the St. Mary's River.[49] The leaders of the East Florida expedition had expected a mighty French fleet rather than two small vessels. This was surely a blow to the troops' morale. However, without Mangourit's efforts to secure the obedience of the crew of *de Las Casas*, the expedition against East Florida could not have relied upon even two ships showing up at St. Mary's.

At the end of Mangourit's mission, the East Florida expedition was the one most likely to succeed of the two expeditions that Genet had entrusted to the consul. At first, however, the most important operation was the one against Spanish-held Louisiana. Mangourit and Genet agreed that backwoodsmen should be secretly recruited. Then, this unit of South Carolinians was to march to Kentucky and link up with other pro-French forces. Their primary objective was to take New Orleans.[50] The command of the unit to be raised in South Carolina was given to William Tate, who was commissioned a colonel of the Revolutionary Legion of America.[51] His subordinates included Stephen Drayton, Governor Moultrie's private secretary and president of the Republican Society of South Carolina.[52]

The consul lost confidence in the Louisiana operation because of two issues. First, Tate and Drayton requested advances to help them in the recruiting effort. They received their advances from the sale of *l'Embuscade*'s prizes, which the consul doled out very reluctantly.[53] Second, Tate did not keep his recruiting efforts secret. He published recruiting advertisements.[54]

After the beginning of March 1794, the consul began concentrating almost exclusively on the East Florida expedition. Whereas the leader of the East Florida expedition requested and received supplies, Tate only requested more advances. When Fauchet issued a proclamation to end Mangourit's invasion projects, the consul continued the East Florida operation, but postponed the Louisiana expedition.

The East Florida expedition had very capable commanders. A Frenchman, C.-M.-F. de Bert,[55] who was involved in the operation from the beginning, convinced Samuel Hammond[56] to lead an element of an invading force against East Florida. Hammond was commissioned as a colonel in the Revolutionary Legion of the Floridas, and Bert was to serve as his second in command with the rank of major.[57]

By the fall of 1793, Bert reported to Mangourit that Hammond was making good progress in preparing for the invasions. Hammond's usefulness was enhanced, the major explained, because of his personal interest in the Indian-trading firm of Hammond and Fowler. Samuel Hammond's brother, Abner,

was a partner in the firm. Both Hammonds wanted to see their firm replace its Spanish-backed rival in the frontier Indian trade. Mangourit wryly added that Bert himself had speculated in frontier real estate.[58]

"How," the consul asked in December 1793, "to keep such an affair secret?"[59] It was too late. The South Carolina legislature was already taking steps against the expeditions. Stephen Drayton was arrested and recruiting was banned. Drayton did not give up on the Louisiana operation, agreeing with the consul that the project must continue. Neither did Drayton accept his arrest without protest. He sued the legislature for illegal seizure of his personal papers. After Mangourit's recall and much wrangling back and forth, the matter was dropped.[60]

For their part, the Spanish in East Florida were quickly discovering that something was afoot in Charleston. Ironically, it was Abner Hammond who informed the Spanish of the invasion plans, apparently because he wanted an indemnity for some confiscated supplies. For his services, the Spanish arrested Abner Hammond and several others involved in the invasion plot.[61]

Despite the arrest of his brother, Samuel Hammond continued preparing for the Florida operation. In February and March 1794, a number of war councils were held. The leaders agreed that 10 April was to be the date for the assembly of the Revolutionary Legion on the St. Mary's River. The level of enthusiasm was high, inspiring some of the officers from Tate's force to enlist with Hammond. Hammond gave the final orders around the end of March. Simultaneously, word reached Charleston of Fauchet's order to end Mangourit's projects.[62]

Had the invasion occurred, Mangourit was prepared with a plan for a post-invasion Florida. The plan called for no French annexation. Once secured, the territory was to be considered a French possession until an assembly could be convened. The Floridians could then design their own government institutions. For Mangourit, a friendly republic in Florida would offer France a base from which to dominate the Caribbean.[63]

The consul drafted a treaty with the Creeks to not only gain the alliance of the Native Americans, but also to improve race relations along the frontier. Mangourit also believed that the establishment of a "free and independent republic, a sister and friend of France, in the form of the most pure democracy" could not be done by men who "calculate the best use of their Negroes." The leaders of the expedition balked, and the consul pragmatically backed off. Mangourit drafted an address to the Floridians that was to be published once the Revolutionary Legion entered Spanish territory. One of the major provisions was a guarantee of the ownership of slaves. At a later date and under French auspices, the consul hoped that a conversion away from slavery could take place.[64]

Mangourit's conception of the end result of the invasions shows a high level of idealism leavened with the practical necessities of getting the job done. His recognition of how to balance the ideals of the French Revolution against these necessities are a tribute to his capabilities as an administrator and diplomat. The point to which the invasion preparations proceeded before his recall shows that he was not merely an active man but that he knew how to direct his activity towards achieving his goals. However, Mangourit's recall by the Jacobin government squandered the opportunity that the consul had helped create.

With the ascendancy of the Jacobins in France, the days of the Genet mission were numbered. Robespierre's propaganda claimed that "all the pygmies of the Gironde" were traitors; that they constituted a "*faction Anglaise*" in France. As their agent in America, Genet was charged with intentionally planning to cause a rupture in Franco-American relations.[65] When Mangourit heard of this speech in late February 1794, he wrote to console Genet: "They say you are very mistreated. Robespierre is too pure, too true a republican not to retract this when he knows the truth." However, Mangourit's recall was well on its way, too.[66] By the middle of February 1794, Mangourit realized the inevitability of his recall, but was determined to continue the operations.[67]

However, the new French minister, Joseph Fauchet, was under strict orders to put an end to Genet's projects. On 27 March, Fauchet's proclamation of 6 March, was printed in Charleston newspapers. This

proclamation forbade any Frenchmen from infringing upon American neutrality and revoked French commissions.[68] Mangourit and the leaders of the expeditions agreed that the projects, at least the East Florida operation, should continue. Tate was therefore dispatched to Philadelphia to lobby Fauchet.[69] On 4 April, the consul gave his final instructions to Samuel Hammond, believing that the colonel could hold at least the St. Mary's region. In addition, the consul warned Hammond to make sure his victories were tempered with republican virtues; "soldiers of tyrants are sometimes courageous, but republican soldiers are always so."[70]

On 7 April, however, Mangourit's replacement, Fonspertius, arrived in Charleston with orders to stop Mangourit's projects. Mangourit stalled the new consul, arguing that it was too late to stop the Florida expedition. Nevertheless, Fonspertius sent out dispatches to halt the operation. Meanwhile, the crew of *de Las Casas* had met with some of the leaders of the expedition at the town of St. Mary's. Two hundred men under the direct command of Samuel Hammond were advancing in the interior.

The collapse of the expedition was heralded by the appearance of the schooner *Hawke* at the town of St. Mary's on 24 April with Fonspertius's dispatches. Mangourit and his family were on board the schooner to be transferred to *de Las Casas* for transport directly to Philadelphia. Probably at the urging of the ex-consul, Captain Branzon landed some supplies and men on Amelia Island, at the mouth of the St. Mary's River, before sailing away. These men prepared to defend their position even as the mastermind of the affair sailed away to an uncertain future.[71]

Fauchet received a number of requests for continuing the operations. Reluctantly, the new minister carried out his instructions and refused further aid.[72] Mangourit soon sailed for France to defend himself to the dreaded Committee of Public Safety. Fortunately for Mangourit, he did not reach Paris until September 1794,[73] by which time Robespierre had fallen and a new, more conservative government had taken power in France. The Thermidorian government, like the Girondin government, followed an aggressive foreign policy. Had Mangourit been forced to defend himself to Robespierre, the ex-consul may not have survived. Under Napoleon's governments, Mangourit faded into obscurity. After writing several books and achieving a due amount of honors, he died on 17 February 1829.

The study of the lives of such lower-level revolutionaries as Mangourit offers a unique perspective on the diplomacy of the French Revolution. His abilities as a diplomat allowed the consul to maintain an amicable relationship with Governor Moultrie, as contrasted with Genet's bitterness toward Thomas Jefferson. His energy, tenacity and administrative ability held the invasions together.

In the two years following Mangourit's departure from Charleston, there was a good deal of activity directed against the Spanish in the Floridas. Rebellions cropped up, but the Spanish maintained their hold on Florida. French agents remained on Amelia Island, attracting those who were dissatisfied with Spanish rule. French privateers continued activities in Spanish waters and helped to supply the band on Amelia Island. In late 1795, the French flag was raised over the small fort. Fauchet's successor, Pierre Adet, ordered that the soldiers be supplied from Charleston. However, when word reached Adet of peace between France and Spain, these supplies were rerouted to St. Domingue.[74]

The significance of these activities is that there continued to be a healthy body of support for a French-aided invasion of Spanish territory. Also, the fact that the Spanish suffered defeats at the hands of small bands of unsupported American adventurers[75] leaves an impression that, had Mangourit's plan been executed, Florida could have been taken.

What would France have gained with a foothold in Florida? Based on Mangourit's guidelines, the French Republic could not have annexed the territory outright. However, France would not have had to garrison Florida to the same extent that France would have had to garrison a colony. At the same time, access to supplies, ports and manpower would have been gained and the republican ideals of the French Revolution would have been successfully exported.

Although Spain made peace with France in 1795, France did not gain Louisiana until 1801. Florida

could have provided a base for another attack on Louisiana. France had also lost the opportunity to use Florida as a base to dominate the Caribbean, including her unruly colony of St. Domingue. Of course, any use of Florida as a base against St. Domingue would have required a directive from the French government. Such a policy was only formulated by Napoleon in 1802.[76] No matter what might have happened, it is clear that France lost an ideal and cost-effective opportunity to revive her fortunes in the Americas by not allowing Mangourit's expedition to reach its conclusion.

ENDNOTES[77]

[1] For biographical information on Mangourit, see: Frederic Masson, *Le DÈpartement des Affaires ...trangËres pendant la RÈvolution* (Paris, 1877), 323-25; trans. and quoted in Frederick J. Turner, ed., "Correspondence of the French Ministers to the United States, 1791-1797," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1903* II (1904), 930-32, n. b; R.R. Palmer, "A Revolutionary Republican: M.A.B. Mangourit," *William and Mary Quarterly* 3 (1952): 483-96; Pierre Larousse, *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIX SiËcle*, s.v. "Mangourit," Abraham P. Nasatir and Gary E. Monell, *French Consuls in the United States: A Calendar of Their Correspondence in the Archives Nationales* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1967), 564-565.

[2] Louis XVI, 2 March 1792, "Provisions de Consul de Fr. auprËs les Etats des Carolines–Septentrionale & meridionale & de la Georgie en faveur du S. Mangouri [*sic*]–resident ‡ Charlestown," France, Archives des Affaires ...trangËres, Sous-Series BIII, carton 439 (microfilm in Library of Congress, Manuscript Division [hereinafter cited as AAE BIII 439]), folio 329. For details of the passage, see Minister of marine to Mangourit, 9 April 1792, AAE, BIII 439, f. 339.

[3] Mangourit to Monge, 14 September 1792, AAE BI, 372, ff. 401-402; Monge to Mangourit, 11 February 1793, AAE BIII 439, f. 5, extract in , Frederick J. Turner, ed., "The Mangourit Correspondence in Respect to Genet's Projected Attack upon the Floridas, 1793-1794," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1897* (1898) [hereinafter cited as MC], 582; Mangourit to Tintignac, sometime after February 1793, printed in MC, 581. See also Richard K. Murdoch, *The Georgia-Florida Frontier, 1793-1796: Spanish Reaction to French Intrigue and American Designs*, University of California Publications in History, eds. J.W. Caughey, D.K. Bjork, R.H. Fisher, vol. XL (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1951; reprint, Millwood, NY: Kraus Reprint Co., 1974), 12 (page references are to reprint edition). For the consul's contacts with prominent South Carolinians, see: Mangourit to minister of marine, 15 January 1793, France, Archives des Affaires ...trangËres, Correspondance Consulaire et Commerciale, ...tats-Unis, Charleston, tome 2, 1793-1799 (Neuilly-sur-Marne, Fr.: SociÈtÈ d'IngÈniÈrie et de Microfilmage, 1992, microfilm [hereinafter cited as AAE CCC]), f. 001. Some of these letters can be found partially printed and translated in Richard K. Murdoch, "Correspondence of French Consuls in Charleston, South Carolina, 1793-1797," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 1 (1973); Maude H. Woodfin, "Citizen Genet and His Mission" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1928), 95-98; Charles Fraser, *Reminiscences of Charleston* (Charleston: John Russell, 1854), 49-51.

[4] See M. J. Sydenham, *The Girondins*, University of London Historical Studies, vol. VII (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1972), 100; Robert Louis Stein, *LÈger FÈlicitÈ Sonthonax: The Lost Sentinel of the Republic*

(Cranbury, NJ: Associated Universities Presses, 1985), 90; George D. Terry, "A Study of the Impact of the French Revolution and the Insurrections in Saint-Domingue upon South Carolina: 1790-1805" (M.A. thesis, University of South Carolina, 1975); Thomas O. Ott, *The Haitian Revolution, 1789-1804* (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1973).

[5] Harry Ammon, *The Genet Mission* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1973), 10-17; M. J. Sydenham, *The Girondins*, 101-107.

[6] Britain had gained Canada and Spain had gained Louisiana as a result of the settlement of the Seven Years' War. See E. Wilson Lyon, *Louisiana in French Diplomacy, 1759-1804* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1934), 13-69 and F. J. Turner, "The Origin of Genet's Projected Attack on Louisiana and the Floridas," *AHR* III (1897-1898): 650-671.

[7] Alexander DeConde, *Entangling Alliance: Politics and Diplomacy under George Washington* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1958), 183; Instructions to Genet, December 1792, Frederick J. Turner, ed., "Correspondence of the French Ministers to the United States, 1791-1797," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1903* II (1904): 202-211 [hereinafter cited as CFM]; Additional instructions and background information are in Archives des Affaires ...trangËres, Correspondance politique, ...tats-unis (Paris: French Reproductions, various dates, photostats in Library of Congress, Manuscript Division [hereinafter cited as AAE CP EU]), vols. 36 and 37; Ammon, 22-29; Albert Hall Bowman, *The Struggle for Neutrality: Franco-American Diplomacy During the Federalist Era* (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1974), 42-43.

[8] "Liste des visittes faites au Citoyen Genet ‡ Charleston," April 1793, Genet Papers (Washington, DC: Library of Congress Photoduplication Service, 1969, microfilm), reel 5, container 9, f. 2735 [hereinafter cited as Genet Papers, L.C.].

[9] See Genet to foreign minister, 16 April 1793, CFM, 213; Mangourit to Sonthonax, 29 April 1793, AAE CCC, f. 013.

[10] Genet to Mangourit, 17 April 1793, Genet Papers, L.C., reel 5, container 9, ff. 2720-2723.

[11] For more on the Genet Mission, see: Ammon; DeConde; Bowman; William Frederick Keller, "American Politics and the Genet Mission, 1793-1794" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1951); Regina Katherine Crandall, "Genet's Projected Attack on Louisiana and the Floridas, 1793-94" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1902); and Eugene R. Sheridan, "The Recall of Edmond Charles Genet: A Study in Transatlantic Politics and Diplomacy," *Diplomatic History* 18 (Fall 1994): 463-488. For Mangourit's opinion of the execution of Louis XVI, see: Mangourit to minister of foreign affairs, 10 December, 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 168-170.

[12] Mangourit's understanding of the discontented nature of South Carolina's pro-French faction is echoed in George C. Rogers, Jr., *Evolution of a Federalist: William Loughton Smith of Charleston (1758-1812)* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1962), 253-255., and Terry, 27.

[13] Mangourit to minister of foreign affairs, 10 December, 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 171verso-172.

[14] Moultrie's land speculation included interest in the Yazoo country as shown in Keller, 394.

[15] A captain of federal troops that Mangourit visited might have been William Tate, who later served in the invasion schemes. See Crandall, 45. The captain offered to lead an attack on the Spanish himself. See Mangourit to Genet, 28 April &11 June 1793, printed in MC, 578-580; Unaddressed letter, probably Mangourit to Genet, 6 May 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 21-24vo; Mangourit to Minister of Marine Monge, 29 May 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 029-036.

[16] The letter to Moultrie can be found in South Carolina, Records of the General Assembly, Governor's Messages, 1792-1795, letter number 577, 30 November 1793, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, microfilm. Mangourit to Genet, 11 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 85vo-86; Mangourit to foreign minister, 30 October 1793, AAE CCC, f. 157; Mangourit to Genet, 20 October 1793, AAE CCC, f. 142.

[17] Mangourit to Genet, 9 October 1793, AAE CCC, f. 072vo-073.

[18] Mangourit to Genet, 9 October 1793, AAE CCC, f. 073; Mangourit to Genet, 11 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 87-88. Marret to Mangourit, 6 September 1793, enclosed in Mangourit to Genet, 11 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 118-118vo.

[19] This committee had been formed, according to Mangourit, by the French colonial aristocrats, the British and their Carolinian supporters to lobby Moultrie to ban foreign blacks from South Carolina. For more information on the citizen's committee, such as its membership, see Terry, 48-50 and 61-63.

[20] Mangourit to Genet, 11 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 089-089vo & 091.

[21] Ibid., ff. 090 & 095vo.

[22] Mangourit to Genet, 11 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 95vo-96.

[23] Michel-Ange-Bernard de Mangourit, *MÈmoire de Mangourit. Addresses des municipalitiÈs, sections, SociÈtÈ rÈpublicaine de Charleston, et des gouverneur et citoyens de l'Ètat de la Caroline du Sud, ‡ Mangourit, consul de la RÈpublique FranÁaise, sur sa destitution* (Paris: Imprimerie de Guiffier, 1795, microfilm from New York Public Library, copy also in AAE CCC f. 238), 2-3.

[24] Proclamation of the Republican Society of South Carolina, August 1793, Papers of the Republican Society of South Carolina, (Boston Public Library: General Microfilm Co., 1971, microfilm [hereinafter cited as Republican Society Papers]). See Michael L. Kennedy, "A French Jacobin Club in Charleston, South Carolina, 1792-1795," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 91, no. 1 (January 1990): 13 and 16. Eugene P. Link, "The Republican Society of Charleston," *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association* (1943): 27-28.

[25] Mangourit to foreign minister, 22 February 1794, AAE CCC, f. 216 bis vo.

[26] Mangourit to Sonthonax, 29 April 1793, AAE CCC, f. 013; Mangourit to Genet, 30 April 1793, AAE CCC, f. 017; Woodfin, 585; Jackson, 52, 55, 60-62. See also George C. Rogers, Jr., *Charleston in the Age of the Pinckneys*, 51-53.

[27] Woodfin, 101, 111-112.

[28] Mangourit to Genet, 11 October 1793, AAE CCC, f. 95.

[29] Mangourit to Genet, 18 September 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 064-vo. Jacques Delaire was among other colonial aristocrats that Mangourit placed at these dinners.

[30] The British had already been in touch with counterrevolutionary forces in St. Domingue as early as April 1793. Robert Louis Stein, *Sonthonax*, 90. Mangourit to minister of foreign affairs LeBrun, 18 or 28 June 1793, AAE CCC, f. 47.

[31] Mangourit to Genet, 27 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 145-145vo. See also Mangourit to Genet, 18 September 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 64vo-65.

[32] See: Mangourit to Genet, 18 September 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 064vo-065vo; Mangourit to Moultrie, 23 October 1793, ff. 154-154vo; and Mangourit to Genet, 27 October 1793, AAE CCC, 146vo-148. See also letter of Lt. Col. John Whitelocke, 4 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 098-103vo.

[33] Stanley Elkins and Eric McKitrick, *The Age of Federalism*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 375-414. For various demonstrations, see:Charles Fraser, *Reminiscences*, 35-38; Mangourit to Genet, 13 January 1794, Archives des Affaires ...trangËres, Correspondance politique, ...tats-unis, SupplÈment (Paris: French Reproductions, various dates, photostats in Library of Congress, Manuscript Division [hereinafter cited as AAE CP EU SUPT]), vol. 30, f. 266; Mangourit to Genet, probably around 15 March 1794, AAE CCC, f. 185-187vo.; Mangourit to Genet, probably 17 March 1794, AAE CCC, f. 200.

[34] Kennedy, "A French Jacobin Club," 4-22.

[35] Delaire was a former municipal officer in St. Domingue and an administrator of the national subsidy. He had embezzled from the funds for which he had been responsible and hurriedly left the colony, probably with the agents of the commissioners in hot pursuit. He died in Charleston in 1814. Mangourit to LeBrun, 18 June 1793, AAE CCC, f. 45vo; Mangourit to Genet, 11 October 1793, AAE CCC, f. 093 (duplicated at f. 120vo); Mangourit to Foreign Minister Deforgues, 19 October 1793, AAE CCC, f. 108vo; and Kennedy, "A French Jacobin Club," 10.

[36] Mangourit to Genet, 18 September 1793, AAE CCC, f. 065-065vo.

[37] Mangourit to Pascal, 5 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff 078-078vo; Mangourit to Genet, 11 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 085-086. Four months before the rumored slave revolt, Mangourit reported that that the ÈmigrÈs were

"poisoning the spirits of Americans" by the prediction of an impending revolt of blacks, both free and slave. Mangourit to LeBrun, 18 June 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 045vo-046.

[38] Mangourit to Genet, 9 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 071-073vo.; Mangourit to Genet, 11 October 1793, AAE CCC, f. 085. Edward Penman, Jacques Delaire, and the corsair captains were among those who visited the governor. Mangourit to Genet, 11 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 086vo-095; Mangourit to Genet, 11 October 1793, AAE CCC, f. 115; Mangourit to Genet, 20 October 1793, ff. 142-142vo.

[39] Mangourit to Genet, 11 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 086-087 & ff. 109-126; Mangourit to minister of foreign affairs, 19 October 1793, AAE CCC, f. 108.

[40] Mangourit to Genet, 20 October 1793, AAE CCC, f. 144.

[41] Mangourit to Genet, 9 October 1793, AAE CCC, f. 073vo. See also Mangourit to minister of foreign affairs, 10 December 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 170-171; Mangourit to Pascal, 9 October 1793, AAE CCC, f. 078.

[42] Mangourit to minister of foreign affairs, 22 February 1794, AAE CCC, ff. 215-216.

[43] Mangourit to Genet, 29 February 1794, AAE CCC, ff. 218vo-219.

[44] For information on the disposition of French naval units, see: Mangourit to LeBrun, 18 June 1793, AAE CCC, f. 045; Mangourit to Genet, 4 August 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 056-057; *Etat des Prises*, September 30 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 069vo-070vo; Genet to Contre-Amiral Sercey, 4 October 1793, AAE CP EU, vol. 39, part II, ff. 99-103; *Etat–Commissions en Course, deliverÈes ‡ des Corsaires franÁaise dans Le dÈpartement de ce Consulat depuis Le 14 Avril 1793 jusqu'au 30 Septembre*, 11 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 104-105. See also Jackson, 15; Murdoch, *Frontier*, 120.

[45] Jackson, 11-17.

[46] Mangourit to Genet, 11 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 094vo-095 & 115; Josnez to Mangourit [?], no date, enclosed in Mangourit to Genet, 11 October 1793, f. 117; Mangourit to Genet, 27 October 1793, AAE CCC, 146vo-148, Mangourit to foreign minister, 30 October 1793, AAE CCC, ff. 157vo-158.

[47] Mangourit to Genet, 11 January 1794, AAE CP EU SUPT, vol. 30, f. 258; *Extrait des Registres & Minutes de la Chancelerie du Consulat de la Republique franÁaise a Charleston*, January 1794, AAE CP EU SUPT, vol. 30, ff. 240-243vo; Mangourit to Genet, 11 January 1794, ibid., f. 253; Mangourit to Genet, 11 February 1794, AAE CP EU SUPT, ff. 263-264vo.

[48] For the activities of the "colonial aristocrats," see: Mangourit to foreign minister, 22 February 1794, AAE CCC, f. 216 br; Mangourit to foreign minister, 21 February 1794, AAE CCC, f. 208. For Mangourit's attempts to persuade the crew as well as the crew's responses, see the documents found in AAE CP EU SUPT, vol. 30, ff. 246-261, dated 6-9 January 1794 For an account of the funeral, see: Mangourit to officers and crew of *Las Casas*, 9 February 1794, AAE CCC, ff. 182-vo. For the crew's legal difficulties, see: Mangourit to Genet, probably around 17

March 1794, AAE CCC, ff. 200-vo.; Mangourit to Magistrates of the City Council, undated, AAE CCC, ff. 201-vo.; and Jackson, 37.

[49] For Fauchet's orders and Mangourit's stalling tactics, see: Commissioners to Ministers of Foreign Affairs, 20 May 1794, printed in CFM, 345-347; and Mangourit to Fauchet, 30 March 1794, printed in MC, 645. See also Mangourit to Branzon, 27 March 1794, printed in MC, 643-644. Murdoch, *Frontier*, 34; Jackson, 40-41.

[50] Mangourit to Genet, 6 August 1793, printed in MC, 589.

[51] Tate was a South Carolinian whose family owned ironworks in the upstate. He served in the American Revolution as a lieutenant and was probably a captain in the artillery when Genet arrived. See John D. Ahlstrom, "Captain and Chef de Brigade William Tate: South Carolina Adventurer," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 88 (October 1987): 183-191. Tate's commission, dated 15 October 1793, is in AAE CP EU, vol. 46, part II, f. 181 (also printed in MC, 599).

[52] In 1775, Drayton was a member of the Georgia Council of Safety. In 1778 he served as a deputy quartermaster-general for the Continental Army, Southern Division. See Eugene P. Link, *Democratic-Republican Societies, 1790-1800*, Columbia Studies in American Culture, no. 9 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942; reprint, New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1965), 135 (page references are to reprint edition); and Eugene P. Link, "Democratic-Republican Societies of the Carolinas," *North Carolina Historical Review* 18 (1941): 263.

[53] Mangourit to Genet, 19 October 1793, printed in MC, 602; Mangourit to Genet, 27 October 1793, MC, 602-603; Mangourit to Genet, 29 February 1794, AAE CCC, ff. 218-vo.

[54] Bert to Mangourit, 15 February 1794, printed in MC, 616; Mangourit to Genet, 16 February 1794, printed in MC, 618; Hammond to Mangourit, undated, probably 3-19 March 1794, Republican Society Papers.

[55] During his trip to Savannah, or shortly before, Mangourit made a contact with Bert, an Alsacian who had been a former officer under Casimir Pulaski during the American Revolution. Mangourit to Genet, 3 November, 1793, printed in MC, 603-604; Mangourit to Minister of Marine Monge, 29 May 1793, AAE CCC, f. 030; LeBrun to Mangourit, 13 August 1793, AAE BIII 439, unnumbered folio; Mangourit to minister of foreign affairs, 10 December 1793, AAE CCC, f. 172vo.

[56] Samuel Hammond was a popular member of the Georgia legislature and an Indian fighter. See: Michael P. Morris, "Samuel Hammond: Soldier-Statesman of the Old South," (M.A. Thesis, Georgia Southern College, 1989), 3-36 for an account of Hammond's early years, and 37-73 for Hammond's part in the East Florida project; Stella Drumm, "Samuel Hammond," *Missouri Historical Society Collections* IV (1923): 402-422. See also Mangourit to Genet, 11 June 1793, printed in MC, 580; Mangourit to Bournonville, 24 February 1794; Mangourit to foreign minister, 21 February 1794, AAE CCC, f. 210vo.

[57] Mangourit to Genet, 1 July 1793, printed in MC, 585; Mangourit to Genet, 3 November 1793, MC, 603-604.

[58] Bert to Mangourit, 5 November 1793, Republican Society Papers. Mangourit to Genet, 11 January 1794, AAE CP EU SUPT, vol. 30, f. 265vo.

[59] Mangourit to foreign minister, 10 December 1793, AAE CCC, f. 173.

[60] Michael E. Stevens, ed, *The State Records of South Carolina: Journals of the House of Representatives, 1792-1794* (Columbia: University of South Crolina Press, 1988), xx-xxii, 287, 324-325, 424-427. Mangourit to foreign minister, 10 December 1793, AAE CCC, f. 173.

[61] Charles E. Bennett, *Florida's "French" Revolution, 1793-1795*, (Gainesville, FL: University Presses of Florida, 1981), 33-47; Murdoch, *Frontier*, 38-49.

[62] Hammond to Bert or Mangourit, 12 February 1794, printed in MC, 613-614; Hammond to Mangourit, no date, probably 3-19 March 1794, Republican Society Papers. For the war coucils, see: Mangourit to Genet, 27 February 1794, MC, 621-622; Hammond to Mangourit, undated, probably 3-19 March 1794, Republican Society Papers; group of papers from Bert to Fauchet, AAE CP EU SUPT, vol. 28, part I, f. 143vo.; Hammond to Mangourit, 19 March 1794, printed in MC, 635-636. For the jumping-off date, see: Mangourit to Hammond, 4 April 1794, MC, 653; Mangourit to Genet, 5 March 1794, MC, 627-628.

[63] Mangourit to foreign minister, 10 December 1793, AAE CCC, f. 172vo; Mangourit to Genet, 10 February 1794, printed in MC, 609; Address to the Floridians, no date, MC, 654-656; Mangourit to foreign minister, 21 February 1794, AAE CCC, ff. 210vo-211; Report of Assembly of Leaders of the Expedition at Charleston, 29 March 1794, MC, 630.

[64] Plan for a treaty with the Creeks, probably 6 March 1794, MC, 591-593; Mangourit to foreign minster, 10 December 1794 AAE CCC, f. 172vo; Mangourit to foreign minister, 21 February 1794, AAE CCC, ff. 210vo-211; Address to the Floridians, no date, MC, 654-656.

[65] "Rapport fait ‡ la Convention National au nom du comitÈ de Salut Publique, par le Citoyen Robespierre, membre de ce comitÈ, sur la situation politique de la RÈpublique; le 27 Brumaire, l'an 2 de la RÈpublique," (17 November 1793), AAE CP EU, vol. 39, part V, ff. 279-293.

[66] Mangourit to Genet, 29 February 1794, AAE CCC, ff. 219-vo. Documents relating to Mangourit's recall include: minister of foreign affairs to Hauterive (consul at New York) and Mangourit, 19 November 1793, AAE CCC, f. 167; and "Report on the Causes of the Recall of Mangourit," 24 Brumaire, an II (c. 14 November 1793), MC, 658.

[67] Mangourit to Genet, 29 February 1794, AAE CCC, ff. 218-vo; Mangourit to Fauchet, 25 March 1794, MC, 636-637.

[68] Jackson, 36, 38; Murdoch, *Frontiers*, 22.

[69] Bert to Mangourit, 30 March 1794, MC, 647-648. Report of Assembly of Leaders of the Expedition at Charleston, 29 March 1794, MC, 629-632. See also: Mangourit to Fauchet, 30 March 1794, printed in MC, 645-647; Mangourit to Fauchet, 31 March 1794, in MC, 648-650.

[70] Mangourit to Hammond, 4 April 1794, MC, 653.

[71] Commissioners to minister of foreign affairs, 20 May 1794, printed in MC, 660; Murdoch, *Frontier*, 36; Jackson, *Privateers*, 42.

[72] See Fauchet to George Rogers Clark, 9 Fructidor An II, AAE CP EU SUPT, vol. 28, part I, ff. 48-49; Stephen Drayton to Fauchet, 15 April 1794, ibid., ff. 95-96; Fauchet to Bert, 3 Messidor An II, AAE CP EU SUPT, vol. 28, part II, ff. 156-vo; Fauchet to minister of foreign affairs, 20 May 1794, CFM, 345.

[73] Mangourit (in Paris) to the Committee of Public Safety, 6 September 1794, AAE CCC, f. 235.

[74] Murdoch, *Frontier*, 71-97.

[75] See Murdoch 71-85; and Bennett 172-185.

[76] Ronald Caldwell, "Bonaparte's Efforts to Obtain Florida, 1799-1803," *Papers of the Consortium on Revolutionary Europe, 1750-1850* (1994): 517-528.

[77]

CONSTITUTION

I. The name of this organization shall be the South Carolina Historical Association.

II. The objects of this Association shall be to promote historical studies in the state of South Carolina, to bring about a closer relationship among persons living in this state who are interested in history, and to encourage the preservation of historical records.

III. Membership shall be open to anyone interested in the objectives of the Association. Annual Dues shall be determined by the Executive Committee.

After having been a member of the Association for ten years and upon reaching the age of sixty-five, any member may be designated an emeritus member by the Secretary. Emeritus members have all the rights and privileges of membership without being required to pay the annual dues.

Student members shall pay annual dues at half-rates.

IV. The officers shall be president, vice president, secretary, and treasurer; these shall be elected at each annual meeting. The Executive Committee shall normally nominate one person for each office. The vice president shall be the automatic nominee for president. Nomination from the floor may be made for any office.

Officers shall have the duties and perform the functions customarily attached to their respective offices with such others as may from time to time be prescribed.

V. The Executive Committee shall be composed of the officers, the editor of *The Proceedings*, and three other members elected for a term of three years. The duties of the Executive Committee shall be to fix the date and place of the annual meeting, to attend to the publication of *The Proceedings* of the Association, to prepare a program for the annual meeting, to prepare a list of nominations for the officers of the Association as provided in Article IV, to supervise expenditures of the Association's funds, and such other duties as may be from time to time assigned to them by the Association. There shall be such other committees as the president may appoint, or be instructed to appoint, by resolutions of the Association.

VI. There shall be an annual meeting of the Association at the time and place appointed by the Executive Committee.

VII. A. The Association shall publish annually its proceedings to be known as *The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*. It shall contain the minutes of the annual meeting together with such papers and documents selected by the Executive Committee. Each fifth year, *The Proceedings* shall include a copy of the constitution of the Association. At least every five years, *The Proceedings* shall include a current list of the membership.

B. All papers read at the annual meeting shall become the property of the Association except as otherwise may be approved by the Executive Committee.

C. The Executive Committee shall annually elect an editor of *The Proceedings* who shall have authority to appoint an associate editor and shall be a member of the Executive Committee.

VIII. In the event of dissolution, the remaining assets of the Association, if any, shall be donated by the Executive Committee to another organization which shares the objects and aims of the Association.

IX. The Publication Endowment Fund exists to supplement the income available for the publication of *The Proceedings*. Contributions may be made by anyone, and they will be acknowledged in writing.

The Fund will be administered by three trustees: the president, the treasurer, and the editor of *The Proceedings*. The trustees shall invest the Fund so as to obtain a secure and steady income and report annually to the membership the status of the Fund.

The trustees may designate annually a sum no greater than 80 percent of the earnings of the Fund to defray the cost of printing *The Proceedings* and add the surplus of earnings each year to the principal.

Should the Executive Committee determine that the Fund is no longer necessary for the purpose for which it was established, they shall recommend that this Article be removed from the constitution. If the Fund is liquidated, the Executive Committee shall make an unrestricted gift of the principal to the endowment fund of the University of South Caroliniana Society or similar historical repository in South Carolina and transfer the balance of the earnings to the treasury of the Association.

X. The Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the members present at the annual meeting.

Minutes of the sixty-seventh annual meeting of the SCHA
March 8, 1997.

The sixty-seventh annual meeting of the South Carolina Historical Association convened at the South Carolina State Museum in Columbia, South Carolina on Saturday, March 8, 1997. An estimated 135 members and guests attended the day-long meeting on a very pleasant March day. (The day was dramatically different from the last March meeting at the museum in 1993 when it snowed!) Following the registration, informal gathering, and coffee and pastries in the Vista Room, members assembled in respective presentation rooms in the museum for the first morning sessions which convened at 8:45 am.

Session One-A, entitled **Advanced Placement History Panel,** featured presentations by the following persons regarding their experiences as readers and/or instructors for Advanced Placement history: William Brockington, USC-Aiken, AP European History, Constance Schultz, USC-Columbia, AP United States History, Frances Racine, Spartanburg High School, AP United States History, and George Fain, Spartanburg High School, AP European History.

Session One-B, entitled **Politics and Society in Proprietary South Carolina**, was chaired by Charles Lesser, South Carolina Dept. of Archives & History, who also gave comments. The session featured papers by Bertrand Van Ruymbeke, College of Charleston, on "The Huguenot Quest for Naturalization in Proprietary South Carolina;" Meaghan Duff, College of William and Mary, on "Creating a Plantation Province: Proprietary Land Policies and Early Settlement Patterns;" and Louis H. Roper, SUNY at New Paltz, "The Lords Proprietors: A Reassessment."

Session One-C, **Fresh Perspectives on Barbarian Europe,** consisted of a panel of closely-related papers coordinated by Ralph W. Mathisen, USC-Columbia. Presentations included "Barbarians and Romans: The Alamannic Perspective," by Wendell Tate, USC-Columbia; "Barbarians as a Destabilizing Factor in the Late Roman Empire: The Case of Magnus Maximus," by Walter Roberts, USC-Columbia; "Anianus of Orleans and the Barbarians at the Gate," by Tracy Keefer, USC-Columbia; and "Physicians, Sorcerers, and Saints in Merovingian Gaul" by Allen Jones, USC-Columbia.

Following a 15 minute break, the second group of sessions got underway at 10:15 am.

Session Two-A, entitled **African-American History,** was chaired by Elaine Nichols, Curator of African-American Culture & History, South Carolina State Museum, who also offered comments. This session encompassed papers by Chris Carbaugh, Christ Church Episcopal School, on "Rosenwald Schools;" Jackie R. Booker, South Carolina State University, on "Reconstructing the African-American Family: Apprenticeship Laws, Planter Resistance, and the South Carolina Freedmen's Bureau, 1865-1872;" and Cherisse R. Jones, University of Charleston, on "Black Women's Club Movement in Charleston, South Carolina, 1916-1930."

Session Two-B, **Proprietary South Carolina,** included papers by Laylon Wayne Jordan, College of Charleston, "A World within Themselves: St. John's Colleton, 1720-1750;" Carol E. Borchert,

Historic Charleston Foundation, "Urban and Plantation Domestic Landscapes: A Federal Period Charleston Case Study;" and Michael Morris, USC-Aiken, "Ahead of Their Time: South Carolina's Indian Commissioners and the Struggle to Control the Trade." Robert Weir, USC-Columbia, chaired the session and also provided comments on the papers.

Session Two-C, **Empires and Imperialism,** included both panel and individual presenters. The panel portion was entitled "Perpetuating Empires--Africa and Latin America, Old Perceptions and New," and included presentations by Virginia S. Williams, Winthrop University, on "Alternative U. S. Intellectuals and Latin America; Reevaluating the Historiography of U.S.-Latin American Relations," and Ishita Ghosh, Winthrop University, on "Beyond Empire: Language and Reconstruction." Other individual papers given in this session were "The Breakup of the Soviet Union: Why Didn't We See it Coming?" by Valdis Lumans, USC-Aiken and "Why Thailand was Never a European Colony," by David L. Hess, USC-Spartanburg. Chair/commentator for the session was Ron Atkinson, USC-Columbia.

The third group of sessions for the day began at 11:45.

Session Three-A, **Women's History**, was chaired by Kari Frederickson, University of Central Florida. It encompassed the following presentations: Molly E. Hennen, USC-Columbia, "From the Gay 90s to the Roaring 20s: The Role of Clothing in the Lives of South Carolina Women, 1890-1925;" Alexia Jones Helsley, South Carolina Archives & History, "Unsung Heroines of the Carolina Frontier;" and Mary Gallant, University of Florida, "Notes from a Charleston Childhood." Professor Frederickson also provided comments.

Session Three-B, entitled **20th Century South Carolina,** featured presentations by Steven T. Gyorffy, Trident Technical College, on "Thomas Richard Waring, Jr;" by Ernest M. Lander, Jr., Clemson University, Emeritus, on "The Hartwell Dam and 'the Brave Professor': A Memoir;" and by Albert C. Hester, USC-Columbia, "From Cotton to Pines: New Deal Impact on the South Carolina Rural Landscape." Marvin Cann, Lander University, chaired this session and made comments.

Session Three-C, **Charleston or The Holy City,** was chaired by John Hammond Moore, Author and Independent Historian. It encompassed the following papers: Susan L. King, Records Coordinator, City of Charleston, "Children of the City: The Charleston Orphan House, 1790-1950;" and Robert Alderson, USC-Columbia, "Charleston's French Revolutionary Consul: Michel-Ange-Bernard de Mangourit, 1792-1794." John Moore served as commentator, also.

Following the morning sessions, members and guests of the SCHA gathered in the Vista Room of the Museum for **Lunch and the Annual Business Meeting.** President Amy McCandless introduced Roger Stroup of the State Museum who welcomed the SCHA. President McCandless then called for reports from members of the executive board. Calvin Smith, secretary, reported on the "Newsletter" and requested member information for the May "Newsletter" be sent to him by May 1. William Brockington, treasurer, gave the financial report which had also appeared in the February "Newsletter." Michael Morris, serving as acting editor of the **Proceedings,** announced the distribution of the **1996 Proceedings** at this meeting. Mailings for those not attending were to be made subsequent to the meeting. Morris also announced that the 1997 Proceedings were underway and were expected to be ready for distribution by late summer. President McCandless then

introduced executive board member, Edward Lee, to make the Hollis Prize Awards for papers presented at the 1994 and 1995 annual meetings. Kari Frederickson won the prize for the best paper by a student member for "A Family Affair: Race, Gender, and the Familial Metaphor in the Dixiecrat Movement, 1948-1950." Belinda Gergel won the prize for the best paper by a regular member for "The Israelites of Columbia, South Carolina: The Development of an Antebellum Jewish Community." Both papers had been presented at the 1995 meeting and have appeared in the 1996 issue of the Proceedings.

Next, the following item of business occurred. Two committees for the Hollis Prize Awards, recommended by the executive board, were proposed to the members. One committee is to be for the best student paper and one for the best non-student paper. The committees are to have three members each, are to be appointed by the president every other year, and are to consist of SCHA members who do not have a paper under consideration for an award at the time. A ballot is to be distributed with the September "Newsletter" for members to vote on this proposal.

Following the above committee proposal, the slate of officers recommended by the nominating committee for the coming year was presented as follows:

President--Terry Helsley
Vice-President--J. Edward Lee
Secretary--Calvin Smith
Treasurer--William Brockington
Proceedings Editor--Michael Morris
Members of the Executive Board: Fritz Hamer, Katherine Cann, and Katherine Haldane.

There were no nominees from the floor and the slate was accepted by acclamation.

President McCandless then introduced Lunch Speaker, Catherine Clinton, of the Dubois Institute, Harvard University and author of several books focusing on the lives of women in the Old South. Dr. Clinton spoke on the topic, "'Wallowing in a Swamp of Sin': Parson Weems, Sex, and Murder in Early South Carolina." The topic is related to a forthcoming book and presented aspects of Weems's notorious stories based on the above subject.

After announcing that the next annual meeting would be held at the Citadel in Charleston on March 7, 1998, President McCandless turned over the gavel to incoming president, Terry Helsley. The business meeting was then adjourned for individuals to attend the final afternoon sessions scheduled for 2:15.

Session Four-A, **19th Century South Carolina**, was chaired by J. Edward Lee, Winthrop University, and consisted of papers by Gerald R. Roys, Benedict College, on "Francis Lieber and the Teaching of History and Political Science at South Carolina College, 1835-1856;" Stephen L. Keck, College of Charleston, on "Preserving Freedom in the Age of Modern Democracy: Lord Acton's Interpretation of John C. Calhoun;" and Constance A. Fournier, Coastal Carolina University, "A Social and Economic Interchange between Citizens of Maine and South Carolina Port Towns." J. Edward Lee also offered comments.

Session Four-B, **South Carolina Potpourri**, featured papers by

Don Roper, Local Historian, Piedmont SC, on "Textile Sports: Bat Boy to Keeper of the Story;" Rickie Good, USC-Columbia, on "Matthew Singleton and the High Hills of Santee;" and Whitney Miller, Georgia Institute of Technology, on "South Carolina's Film Industry: The Early Years." Bob McConnell, Librarian, Fort Jackson, served as chair and commentator on the session.

Following these sessions, SCHA members were special guests at a one-person play in the museum auditorium, *"Shoeless Joe: A First Person Impression of Joe Jackson Looking Back at His Baseball Career."* The play was written by Tom Perry; Co-Written and Directed by Melanie G. Reid; and starred Tom McDowell as Shoeless Joe.

After the play, the sixty-seventh annual meeting concluded with a reception in the Vista Room of the Museum where members bade each other farewell until the next meeting in March, 1998.

Respectfully submitted,

Calvin Smith, Secretary